





Exegesis Umbrae – Vox Veritatis  
– Project AngelBook – Volume  
XIII – Part 17  
By Ezekiel Redik Yarbrough  
(DBM ECLIPZE)

## Liminal Archivist's Note

### On the Preservation of Distorted Gnosis and the Dying Digital Veil

There is a strange ache that comes from spending all day in the ruins of spiritual memory.

Fifty books made in one day—an inhuman output—should feel like a triumph. But when the source material is splintered, hostile, and drenched in egoic inversion, what remains is not pride... but hollowness.

This volume, like many in this phase, is not composed of my own words.

It is an act of preservation, not expression.

It is a documentation of liminal knowledge, scraped from a dying web—the final breath of spiritual forums, parapsychology ephemera, early occultist blogs, and yes, even the darker corridors of modern satanic movements.

And herein lies the tension:

Much of what is presented under the name Satanism is a distorted half-truth.

It correctly identifies that Yahweh is not the Most High, and in this way, it mirrors certain Gnostic insights—

but then it derails into ego exaltation, materialism, and psychic hostility. It gets halfway to freedom... and then builds a new prison out of flame and shadow.

And yet—

amidst the mockery, venom, and inversions,

there are real spiritual technologies embedded in the code.

Meditation techniques, psychic development maps, astral awareness, breath control, and ritual frameworks.

Not all of it is corrupted.

Some of it is usable tech.

Some of it may be ancient... wearing a new mask.

So I do not endorse what is preserved here.

But I also refuse to let it vanish into untraceable digital decay.

This is an act of containment as much as curation.

I name this phase liminal, because I know it will not last.

There is only so much of the old internet left to preserve.

Only so much unindexed gnosis hiding behind broken blog links and .org forums that haven't been cached since 2012.

When this phase ends, and I return to creation, I will draw from this tomb of fragments with clarity and discernment.

But for now, I am the one who stands in the gateway—

Archiving the bones, sealing the jars, lighting one gold-lettered candle above a chamber of shadows.

To the reader: proceed with awareness.

This is not scripture.

This is sediment.

It is archived because it is dangerous.

And dangerous knowledge, when preserved with respect, often becomes a mirror for deeper truth.

—Ezekiel Redik Yarbrough

Liminal Phase – Discretio Luminis

If you really have sympathy for the people in the areas where these fires are starting, then instead of putting them through an annual evacuation from rampant fires, consider simply letting nature do what it greatly desires to do. Otherwise, I have no choice but to see everyone involved as trying to stop the fires for their own selfish reasons, for their own self glorification and to make themselves "feel better" about being themselves. You should not value that over the wellbeing of hundreds of thousands of people.

« Last Edit: October 25, 2007, 05:09:09 AM by Prophecy »    Logged

<http://www.thedivinescience.org>

Trillis

Has a lot of posts

Posts By Osmosis

\*\*\*\*\*

Posts: 1233

Karma: 16

. . ::IAO:: . .

View Profile WWW

Re: San Diego Fire

« Reply #71 on: October 25, 2007, 05:23:02 AM »

Very well then.

Logged

<http://www.thedivinescience.org>

Ancheron

Greenhorn

A Familiar Feature

\*\*\*

Posts: 154

Karma: 0

View Profile

Re: San Diego Fire

« Reply #72 on: October 25, 2007, 06:49:22 AM »

I think a better goal would have been the protection of human life, the protection of property, etc.

Logged  
Aude Sapere - Quaere Verum  
Tankdown  
Posts By Osmosis  
\*\*\*\*\*

Posts: 871  
Karma: 2

Hows my logic?

[View Profile](#)

Re: San Diego Fire

« Reply #73 on: October 25, 2007, 09:17:28 AM »

I don't agree with that at all, the basis of that argument is that humanity is something larger and bigger then what it appears to be. Rather then being part of nature and animals from which we have spawn from. Is it really our intelligence that separate us from what we spawn from? Our actions are on this earth just how the birds fly and eat the fruit of the trees and the bugs crawling on the leaves. Just how our actions have hurt this world does not mean it will always do that. Just how a Rhino stumps on fire every time it sees it within its native home. Is this not being involved within nature? Are humans really that different from every other creature on this planet just because our intelligence have surpass all expectations? Last I check we are still flesh and blood living off the fruits of this land just how parasites can live off the fruits of our labor. You know what else is interesting about parasites?

Parasites can help more then they can destroy, mitochondria is theorized to one have been a parasite and does it give us harm? If a tape worm gives assistance in our bodily function and all it wants in return is to add its DNA to ours. Does that mean it must not be involve within its world? Yes we have cause some damage to this world but we can also help the life of this world. Intelligence just like evolution can change over time and altar what are flaws. Yes there are still many plants that can start a another fire but there is a thing called brush fire that people go and burn small amounts of plants to stop overgrowth.

But who is the one who chooses when to take action and when to watch!? Even as a species we must maintain the order of our world and this fire is a threat to others.

Oh and one more thing....regardless of the few words I have spoken there is still something else. If you read some of the news it is being said that the Feds and joining a investigation to a arson probe in one California fires. Should human action lest fix its own greedy ways?

That was weird...I'm not even trying to be a poet or anything, that was freakiest how that came out. Tongue I don't even feel serious about this...I don't know why I just don't see any of your logic a problem.....sorry..

Logged

To do, become -Myself

<---Little demon

Oriens Lvx Lucis

Posts By Osmosis

\*\*\*\*\*

Posts: 766

Karma: -1

[View Profile](#)

Re: San Diego Fire

« Reply #74 on: October 25, 2007, 09:20:42 AM »

I thought it a good idea to mention the following:

Quote

At this exact moment there are at least 100 members taking place in the Council of Solace directing all of their coherent efforts to easing the pain caused by the chaos in the middle east right now, each one of them praying for the end of this war. There is a certain distinction which must be observed however: they are praying for this war to end as soon as it can, as opposed to simply as soon as they want it to. Why this distinction is necessary I will discuss momentarily.

[...]

You have somewhat correctly surmised a part of the problem: the influence of any accumulation of specific thoughts and energies on the astral level will inevitably cause a strain upon the veils which hold one world apart from the other, and the result will always be an excess of that energy pouring into other layers of existence. In the case of the world at present, even if we ignore the world, this is most certainly the case. We have wrapped the sphere of the world in a cradle of evil and filth, and it is suffocating us. However, in your considerations as to the cause of the war, did you consider that you are not God? Did you consider, perhaps, that your will is not the Supreme Will, and that as a child can not always understand why his parents do some of the things they do, perhaps you do not understand some of the things which the more evolved intelligences operate? If these things did not pass into consideration, then you have been quite selfish, and should realize that the scepter is not in your hand. If you believe that your God would never allow such catastrophe or justify such chaos, then

you must remember that it was said "I the Lord your God am the Father of both Good and Evil." Perhaps, just perhaps, there are things at work here greater than the desire for peace, greater than the hope for an end to chaos, and more awe-inspiring than any act of war could ever be.

Apply that example to this situation. Not allowing nature to take its own course can be detrimental to peace, in the long term. As humans, many people feel depending on their individual moral code that this fire is to some degree or another, "evil". However, it is truly just nature taking its course.

Over 500,000 people have been evacuated. Over 1500 homes and properties have been destroyed beyond repair. People are even beginning to place blame on the president (regardless of the veracity of the blame) due to their own inherent feelings of powerlessness in the situation. And yes, we as humans do not have a right to step in the way of nature's natural course for a selfish sense of superiority over nature, or that this planet somehow "belongs" to us.

I agree with Saer. There is no reason to say that magic will not do anything if this is not meant to be; this is equivalent to saying that murder would not occur just because it is against God's will. Both examples are both against God's will (murder being a general rule in most major religions). Magic can and will interfere with the will of higher intelligences beyond the physical realm. Regardless, these same intelligences will achieve their goal, but you will momentarily inhibit them from attaining it, for which there will be consequences later.

This fire is meant to be. Prayer, being inherently by the power of God, will not interfere if it is not "meant to be".

That is all.

Namaste

Logged  
Pages: 1 ... 3 4 [5] 6 7      Print  
« previous next »  
Jump to:  
=> Magick

Powered by MySQL Powered by PHP    Powered by SMF 1.1.18 | SMF © 2013, Simple Machines

Oxygen design by Bloc    Valid XHTML 1.0! Valid CSS!  
<http://forums.vsociety.net/index.php/topic%2C11499.75.html>

1 capture

11 May 2013

Apr    MAY    Jun

11

2012 2013 2014

About this capture  
The Veritas Society

\*

\*HomeForumsChatHelpSearchRetroLoginRegister

Welcome, Guest. Please login or register.

Did you miss your activation email?

May 11, 2013, 11:51:21 AM

Forever

Login with username, password and session length

Search:

Advanced search

207569 Posts in 14757 Topics by 18434 Members - Latest Member: - Enellasteesse

Most online today: 84 - most online ever: 430 (June 28, 2007, 02:58:51 PM)

+ The Veritas Society

|-+ Discussion Areas

||-+ Magick

|||-+ San Diego Fire 0 Members and 1 Guest are viewing this topic. « previous  
next »

Pages: 1 ... 4 5 [6] 7Print

Author Topic: San Diego Fire (Read 8094 times)

Tankdown

Posts By Osmosis

\*\*\*\*\*

Posts: 871

Karma: 2

Hows my logic?

View Profile

Re: San Diego Fire

« Reply #75 on: October 25, 2007, 09:31:57 AM »

Funny how people still find time to blame the president....hehehe...



The problem with selfish actions is that they can go on both roads, true it could be selfish to stop the fire but it can be selfish to let it destroy lives of animals and bugs (I don't really care for bugs myself....ewwww creepy crawlies..). Although I don't believe I ever said anything or heard anything of the fire being "evil". Still I don't really find any problems still...

Logged

To do, become -Myself

<---Little demon

Prophecy

Theurgist

Veritas Teacher

Posts By Osmosis

\*\*\*\*\*

Posts: 1230

Karma: 64

Veritas Teacher

View Profile

Re: San Diego Fire

« Reply #76 on: October 25, 2007, 01:07:41 PM »

Tankdown: My argument was hardly that we are something larger and bigger than nature. In fact, it was quite the opposite. We share this planet with a vast host of other creatures, and just like any of them, we have a right to play a part in the unfoldment of nature's processes. However, unlike most of them, we are some of the few creatures who have the power to operate our own desires on a massive scope. Small animals may play their particular niches, but humans do not confine themselves to particular niches. Because of our power to actually influence nature instead of being always influenced by it, it seems a basic mode of thinking that we should find some compromise with natural events.

Really there is not much of a problem, and I can not believe that this thread has spiraled into six pages of discussion, about three of which appear to be name-calling and emotionally filled outpours. Those who desire to try and stop the fire, whether for their own selfish reasons or for some perceived higher cause, are free to do so. Those who desire to do nothing about the fire, whether for their own selfish reasons or for some perceived higher cause, are free to do so.

Logged

<http://www.thedivinescience.org>

Big Boss

Friggen Crazy  
Veritas Moderator  
Posts By Osmosis

\*\*\*\*\*

Posts: 1458  
Karma: 3

Owner of 100000 V-Points

View Profile WWW

Re: San Diego Fire

« Reply #77 on: October 25, 2007, 01:25:54 PM »

Quote from: Prophecy on October 25, 2007, 01:07:41 PM

Because of our power to actually influence nature instead of being always influenced by it, it seems a basic mode of thinking that we should find some compromise with natural events.

So where is the compromise? At what point do we let nature run its course? At what point do we stop it? To be honest, the thought of it being "wrong" or "bad" to do something that feels so naturally "right" is tearing me up inside.

Come to think of it, I never really had any real reason to want to stop the fire, at least, I never actively thought of one. A lot of the reason might have stemmed from my subconscious desire to do something. (My life is at a real standstill these days)

I'm so... confused about my life... I don't even know what to say right now.

Logged

Join my Folding@Home team and do some good! #159490

Details at <http://folding.stanford.edu/>

Watchtower

Hundred-plus Club

Posts By Osmosis

\*\*\*\*\*

Posts: 929  
Karma: 29

Contemplative Panentheist

[View Profile](#)

Re: San Diego Fire

« Reply #78 on: October 25, 2007, 01:48:44 PM »

Quote

And yes, we as humans do not have a right to step in the way of nature's natural course for a selfish sense of superiority over nature, or that this planet somehow "belongs" to us.

Um, yes we do. If a predator attacks the children of another animal, should the mother/father not fight to protect them, because "nature is running its course?" Nature tries to kill us, and it's our job as living organisms to fight back, that is part of our place within nature. It has nothing to do with the fire being "evil."

@ Prophecy:

I disagree with just about everything you've said (other than the selfish part, which I agree with, but I do not see it as a bad thing), for pretty much the same reasons I've already mentioned. I think you and others have a mistaken view of "nature." I do not believe the fires are on the hands of those trying to preserve the area, and I do not think future fires would be on the hands of any magicians trying to aid in ending it.

Quote

If you really have sympathy for the people in the areas where these fires are starting, then instead of putting them through an annual evacuation from rampant fires, consider simply letting nature do what it greatly desires to do.

I don't know where you're getting the idea that magicians are the ones putting these people through annual evacuations. My mother lives out around that area and I get calls relatively often from her saying that she and her community have had to evacuate due to a fire. Fires are quite common out there due to the natural conditions of the environment. This one happened to be much bigger than most, and while you might say that it is a result of humans always trying to put out the smaller ones, I think that is a mistaken view. As I said, fires are common in the area due to the natural conditions (hot, dry and windy), and a large fire such as this one would probably have occurred sooner if it were not for human efforts. Is it so surprising that eventually, there would naturally arise conditions that would allow this fire to be so hard to fight? While we have become exceedingly good at coping with the destructive side of nature, we are still limited in what we can do. Does this mean that we throw in the towel and stop our efforts, saying it is "the will of nature?"

When a predator kills and eats an animal, is it because that animal has tried to protect itself before? Is it preventing nature from running its course by trying to preserve itself, and is it thus making things worse in the future? Should all animals stop taking measures to protect themselves because it is inevitable that at some point, a predator

will make a kill? Is it wrong for the animals to selfishly try to stay alive, or protect their kin or homes?

Quote

Because of our power to actually influence nature instead of being always influenced by it, it seems a basic mode of thinking that we should find some compromise with natural events.

Actually, animals do influence their environments. The only difference between us and them is that we are exceedingly good at surviving, to the point where most natural threats are much less dangerous to us, and that we have come to operate on a much larger and more advanced scale than other animals. In any case, I don't think that "compromise with natural events" means doing nothing to fight natural disasters.

To be honest, I am surprised this has grown into such a long thread myself. However, name-calling and emotional outbursts aside, it has been a good discussion about magical ethics and the question of when to intervene, with excellent points having been made on both sides, and is the only reason I decided to participate in it in the first place.

« Last Edit: October 25, 2007, 03:24:59 PM by Watchtower » Logged

"For no matter how holy works may be, they do not make us holy because we do them, but in so far as we within ourselves are as we should be, we make holy all that we do, whether it be eating, or sleeping, or working, or what it may."

-Eckhart von Hochheim

Trillis

Has a lot of posts

Posts By Osmosis

\*\*\*\*\*

Posts: 1233

Karma: 16

. . ::IAO:: . .

[View Profile WWW](#)

Re: San Diego Fire

« Reply #79 on: October 25, 2007, 03:21:48 PM »

Quote from: Prophecy on October 25, 2007, 04:49:59 AM

If you really have sympathy for the people in the areas where these fires are starting, then instead of putting them through an annual evacuation from rampant fires, consider simply letting nature do what it greatly desires to do. Otherwise, I have no choice but

to see everyone involved as trying to stop the fires for their own selfish reasons, for their own self glorification and to make themselves "feel better" about being themselves.

Are you saying that we are selfish for trying to help people? I understand now why we shouldn't continue, but my reasoning to help these people is that very few people help each other nowadays. To often you see people in need being ignored. The people with the ability to help humanity are often too selfish to, and it was my interpretation that even though we may have little power it would have been enough to make a difference. So attempting to help the people who are in need because we have the ability to is selfish?

Logged

<http://www.thedivinescience.org>

Zake

Veritas Staff

Veritas Moderator

Posts By Osmosis

\*\*\*\*\*

Posts: 1722

Karma: 0

Veritas Staff

[View Profile](#)

Re: San Diego Fire

« Reply #80 on: October 25, 2007, 05:49:18 PM »

Indeed, this thread has been a fascinating discussion of the ethics of magic. Despite a few bits of name-calling, an exceptional discussion for veritas.

For my own two cents... I believe I can take it as axiomatic that it is "good" to prevent damaging events from happening to others, when possible. The most basic moral response, then, is to attempt to stop the fire or prevent its negative effects, as the fire and the physical suffering and damage that it causes are clearly manifest and visible. Now, if someone will stand and say that, instead, it is morally superior to not stop the fire, due to karma or higher beings or whatever reason, I would demand simply that you observe this reason; as human beings, we must act based upon the information from our senses, be they our physical five or higher ones, or else our actions will inevitably become random and futile. Groundless fear is meaningless; have you seen karma? Have you heard the intentions of whatever higher beings in this matter? If baseless belief or uncertainty is allowed to determine action, even the most powerful beings would be helpless.

« Last Edit: October 25, 2007, 05:51:33 PM by Zake » Logged

Act; for the universe will never forget your movement, nor will it ever forgive your stillness.



Kichara  
Posts By Osmosis

\*\*\*\*\*

Posts: 982  
Karma: 11

Row, Row, Row Your Boat

View Profile WWW

Re: San Diego Fire

« Reply #81 on: October 25, 2007, 08:34:18 PM »

I don't think he meant you are selfish in trying to help people, but that it is selfish to try and stop the fire. I'm sure there are some other ways to help those people other than stop the fires.

Logged  
Hey, whats up?

Please vote in my poll:

<http://forums.vrsociety.net/index.php?topic=12212.0>

adv3n7\_cl0ud

Regular Member

A Veritas Regular

\*\*

Posts: 72  
Karma: 1

Regular Member

View Profile

Re: San Diego Fire

« Reply #82 on: October 25, 2007, 10:19:08 PM »

NWS Digital Forecast Data for San Diego .

.Friday...Mostly sunny. Areas of fog then areas of smoke. Southwest wind 10 mph. High 76.

.Friday Night...Partly cloudy. Areas of smoke then patches of fog. South wind 8 mph. Low 60.

.Saturday...Partly cloudy. Patches of fog in the morning. West wind 8 mph. High 75.

.Saturday Night...Partly cloudy. Fog. Northwest wind 7 mph. Low 60.

.Sunday...Partly cloudy. Patches of fog in the morning. High 76.  
.Sunday Night...Mostly clear. Low 60.  
.Monday...Mostly sunny. High 77.  
.Monday Night...Mostly clear. Low 60.  
.Tuesday...Mostly sunny. High 76.  
.Tuesday Night...Partly cloudy. Fog. Low 60.  
.Wednesday...Partly cloudy. Patches of fog in the morning. High 74.  
.Wednesday Night...Partly cloudy. Fog. Low 60.  
.Thursday...Partly cloudy. Patches of fog in the morning. High 72.

Maybe this will help...

Logged  
Tankdown  
Posts By Osmosis  
\*\*\*\*\*

Posts: 871  
Karma: 2

Hows my logic?

[View Profile](#)

Re: San Diego Fire

« Reply #83 on: October 26, 2007, 09:27:33 AM »

I know prophet, I'm sort of throwing this further cause as what a few people have already said (I like the discussion of the ethics of magic) or whatever. So I guess I did misunderstood your post a little, lol.

Logged  
To do, become -Myself  
<---Little demon  
Steve  
Posts By Osmosis  
\*\*\*\*\*

Posts: 3098  
Karma: 64

[View Profile](#)

Re: San Diego Fire

« Reply #84 on: October 26, 2007, 07:04:30 PM »  
Oi vey. Is that really all you can think of?

Either stop it cold or let it run it's course? The third option of using magic to protect life and property is the best idea so far, but those who think this is a simple case of "either the fire runs it's course and destroys everything or we use magic to stop it completely (at which point it will just occur again the next year)" are mistaken.

There are other options, like attempting to break the massive devastating fire down into smaller, more manageable fires that will still allow the grass to burn but also allowing humans to protect their lives and livelihoods (ie, their homes).

1500 families (the only figure I saw in this thread) are now without a home. Is it truly noble to do nothing and let nature run it's course for fear that next year it could be worse? Even if we stop it cold in it's tracks so that next year it could be worse, humans still have a year to smarten up and prepare for it. Use magic and mundane means to get the governments (city, state, country) to put something in place to preempt such horrible outcomes in the future.

Is it truly "Godly" to allow nature to run it's course, saying that karma or God "could" be doing this for one reason or another? Since the majority of people using this claim are christian-esque, as far as I know, then let me remind you that you follow the same God who declared "For I take no pleasure in the death of anyone, declares the Sovereign LORD. Repent and live!" (Ezekial 18) When has God ever shown contempt to humanity for learning to love and help one another? How can God say "Love your neighbour" and then punish a human for following that very command?

Isn't it more "Godly", isn't it more compassionate, isn't it more practical to help people now, in the immediate timespan, and then also continue to help them set up preventative measures so that the future will not turn out as bleakly as we can predict that it might? If we can stop or diminish the disaster right in front of us, why can't we stop or diminish a future possibility? We can.

But will we? Are those who are helping now also going to be committed to helping in the long run? Or do we wait until a crisis pops up again before helping?

~Steve

« Last Edit: October 26, 2007, 07:06:58 PM by Steve »      Logged

Mastery does not occur when you've performed a feat once or twice. Instead, it comes after years of training, when you realize that you no longer notice when you're performing a feat which used to require so much effort. Even walking takes years of training for a human: why not everything else?

adv3n7\_cl0ud

Regular Member

A Veritas Regular

\*\*

Posts: 72  
Karma: 1

Regular Member

[View Profile](#)

Re: San Diego Fire  
« Reply #85 on: October 27, 2007, 12:20:23 AM »  
Thats a good point Steve,

What if it is a test for us to stick together and help each other?

Logged  
Steve  
Posts By Osmosis  
\*\*\*\*\*

Posts: 3098  
Karma: 64

[View Profile](#)

Re: San Diego Fire  
« Reply #86 on: October 27, 2007, 10:24:07 AM »  
Argh, NO >\_< Stop with the "what if"s.

~Steve  
Logged  
Mastery does not occur when you've performed a feat once or twice. Instead, it comes after years of training, when you realize that you no longer notice when you're performing a feat which used to require so much effort. Even walking takes years of training for a human: why not everything else?

Raitaro  
Posts By Osmosis  
\*\*\*\*\*

Posts: 2151  
Karma: 0

The Knight of Wands

[View Profile](#)

Re: San Diego Fire

« Reply #87 on: October 28, 2007, 05:02:58 AM »

The point of Steve's post was to eliminate the "What ifs". Pretty objective "It is right to help" type message.

Logged

The IneptInitiate

<http://xkcd.com/303/>

<http://xkcd.com/123/>

I got a hot girl and the coolest band I know. I gotta bad habbit of smoking before the show.

I got music I got friends I trust and love. I get into a lot of fights and now my knuckles are all fucked up.....

DarkWaterMoon

Has a lot of posts

Posts By Osmosis

\*\*\*\*\*

Posts: 584

Karma: 0

Has a lot of posts

[View Profile](#)

Re: San Diego Fire

« Reply #88 on: October 28, 2007, 09:57:38 AM »

Thanks for the enlightenment. Why worry about the fire at all but just the wellbeing of the people in the way of the fire....who woulda thought? rolleyes

Logged

Hech

Regular Member

Posts By Osmosis

\*\*\*\*\*

Posts: 1153

Karma: 12

[View Profile](#)

Re: San Diego Fire

« Reply #89 on: October 28, 2007, 10:36:49 AM »

I've learned to hate the "what if" game as an utterly foolish and ignorant endeavor - in my eyes anyway.

Logged

<http://www.thedivinescience.org>

Pages: 1 ... 4 5 [6] 7 Print

« previous next »

Jump to:

=> Magick

Powered by MySQL Powered by PHP Powered by SMF 1.1.18 | SMF © 2013, Simple Machines

Oxygen design by Bloc Valid XHTML 1.0! Valid CSS!

<http://forums.v society.net/index.php/topic%2C11499.90.html>

2 captures

7 Jul 2010 - 2 May 2013

Jul MAY Jun

02

2010 2013 2014

About this capture

The Veritas Society

\*

\*HomeForumsChatHelpSearchRetroLoginRegister

Welcome, Guest. Please login or register.

Did you miss your activation email?

May 01, 2013, 09:22:15 PM

Forever

Login with username, password and session length

Search:

Advanced search

207370 Posts in 14736 Topics by 18410 Members - Latest Member: - MindDisciple

Most online today: 88 - most online ever: 430 (June 28, 2007, 02:58:51 PM)

+ The Veritas Society

|-+ Discussion Areas

||-+ Magick

||-+ San Diego Fire 0 Members and 1 Guest are viewing this topic. « previous

next »

Pages: 1 ... 5 6 [7] Print

Author Topic: San Diego Fire (Read 8072 times)

Sekhmet

Greenhorn

Posts By Osmosis

\*\*\*\*\*

Posts: 641

Karma: 1

Warrior...Not Princess... Klutz...

View Profile

Re: San Diego Fire

« Reply #90 on: November 01, 2007, 09:18:14 PM »

Quote from: Trillis on October 23, 2007, 04:58:57 AM

With so many budding magicians here, I was wondering if it would be at all possible to lend a hand in order to aid in the extinguishing of the fire. Now, the concern that I have is the Astral Politics that could be involved in this fire. Just like when a storm rages overhead there is a battle going on between the elements, so then it is entirely possible that it is also true for this.

"We have a very dangerous, unpredictable situation," said Ron Roberts, chairman of the San Diego County Board of Supervisors. "We have some of the highest temperatures, some of the driest landscape conditions and some of the most powerful winds -- all the ingredients for a perfect firestorm."

Comments and naysayers are welcome.

P.S: I apologize if this post seems a little disorganized, I just woke up Sad.

Here's a rather frightening status report on the fire. Maybe we did help, who knows. The point is too many people are going back to lives in chaos. The fire is starting to die down and I was reading replies from people in the heart of the situation on Veritas with great interest. You guys are all in my thoughts and I hope everything's okay where you are right now.

[http://www.nctimes.com/articles/2007/10/25//news/top\\_stories/1\\_01\\_0110\\_25\\_07.txt](http://www.nctimes.com/articles/2007/10/25//news/top_stories/1_01_0110_25_07.txt)

Logged

Boo-ya!

Pages: 1 ... 5 6 [7] Print

« previous next »



Jump to:  
=> Magick

Powered by MySQL Powered by PHP Powered by SMF 1.1.18 | SMF © 2013, Simple Machines

Oxygen design by Bloc Valid XHTML 1.0! Valid CSS!

[http://vsociety.net/wiki/Spirituality/Philosophy\\_Topics](http://vsociety.net/wiki/Spirituality/Philosophy_Topics)

14 captures

6 Oct 2008 - 8 Sep 2016

Jul SEP Oct

08

2014 2016 2017

About this capture

Spirituality/Philosophy Topics

PageDiscussionView sourceHistory

Speculation on God-like Abilities

Speculation on Death

Category: Significant Forum Topics

Navigation menu

Veritas Society

Main Page

Forums

IRC chat

Recent changes

Random page

Help

Search

Search

Tools

What links here

Related changes

Special pages

Printable version

Permanent link

Page information

Create accountLog in

This page was last modified on 20 July 2007, at 13:42. Privacy policy About Veritas

Disclaimers

Powered by MediaWiki

<http://forums.v society.net/index.php?topic=3096.0>

4 captures

7 Jul 2010 - 17 Jul 2014  
Sep JUL Aug  
17  
2011 2014 2015

About this capture  
The Veritas Society  
\*

\*HomeForumsChatHelpSearchRetroLoginRegister  
Welcome, Guest. Please login or register.  
Did you miss your activation email?  
July 17, 2014, 04:00:36 PM

Forever

Login with username, password and session length  
Search:

Advanced search

214965 Posts in 15322 Topics by 19763 Members - Latest Member: - ksyahu Most  
online today: 132 - most online ever: 430 (June 28, 2007, 02:58:51 PM)

+ The Veritas Society

|-+ The Auditorium

||-+ Main Hall

|||-+ Godlike abilites? 0 Members and 1 Guest are viewing this topic. « previous  
next »

Pages: [1] 2 3 ... 6 Print

Author Topic: Godlike abilites? (Read 10560 times)

Achilles

Greenhorn

New Member

\*

Posts: 9

Karma: 0

Greenhorn

View Profile

Godlike abilites?

« on: August 15, 2004, 03:05:25 PM »

Does anyone here think people have godlike abilities? To do what they want as they please, and no one can stop them? What happens if someone like that emerges and causes something horrible to happen, and something brand new for the world to fear?

Logged

If you never go into battle, then your name will never be remembered...

[/FONT][COLOR][SIZE]

Darkstar

Hundred-plus Club

A Familiar Feature

\*\*\*

Posts: 136

Karma: 0

Hundred-plus Club

[View Profile](#)

Godlike abilities?

« Reply #1 on: August 15, 2004, 03:06:44 PM »

Why wouldn't we? We can change reality, right?

Logged

Osiris X

Regular Member

A Veritas Regular

\*\*

Posts: 78

Karma: 0

Regular Member

[View Profile](#)

Godlike abilities?

« Reply #2 on: August 15, 2004, 03:07:41 PM »

No, sorry to bust your bubble. But anybody can stop somebody. You maybe perfect on one thing, but every man has his weakness.

Logged

Osiris X-Training in Cryokinesis since 2002

Winged\_Wolf

Regular Member

## A Familiar Feature

\*\*\*

Posts: 122

Karma: 0

Regular Member

[View Profile WWW](#)

Godlike abilites?

« Reply #3 on: August 15, 2004, 05:20:03 PM »

Hello, you there up in the stratosphere...come back to the planet. There's a real world here waiting, when you arrive.

It has things like spending 4 years practicing PK so you can occasionally get a ping pong ball to roll across a flat table.

Live with it.

Logged

--Winged Wolf

Get my books:

<http://www.lulu.com/wingedwolfpsion>

The Psion Guild:

<http://www.psionguild.org>

solstice

Dreamwalker

Posts By Osmosis

\*\*\*\*\*

Posts: 2114

Karma: -4

"Receive and transmit..."

[View Profile](#)

Godlike abilites?

« Reply #4 on: August 15, 2004, 06:45:51 PM »

Actually... we all have "god-like" powers, if you concider what peopled used to think made gods.

But not to burst anyone's bubble, but I have seen a friend of mine soften metal, by looking at it. "Un-stopable" was the exact phraise I used, when I told him he should

practice harder hehe

Logged

Tell all the Truth but tell it slant: Success in Circuit lies. Too bright for our infirm Delight. The Truth's superb surprise. As Lightning to the Children eased, with explanation kind. The Truth must dazzle gradually, or every man be blind.

Tefeari: The Giant Impact Hypothesis is a theory

onikirimaru777

Frequent poster

A Veritas Regular

\*\*

Posts: 80

Karma: 0

Frequent poster

[View Profile](#)

Godlike abilites?

« Reply #5 on: August 15, 2004, 10:19:24 PM »

well, can your god-like abilities beat my pistol Cheesy

\*does the newbie dance of shame\*

Logged

BloodyBlade

Regular Member

Settling In

\*

Posts: 41

Karma: 0

Regular Member

[View Profile](#)

Godlike abilites?

« Reply #6 on: August 15, 2004, 11:07:46 PM »

Hmm... I hope you realize that pistols along with their bullets are made of metal. I truly think that someone with the power to soften metal would desire to destroy the world, or take any of it over. If they did people like us would be there to stop them, along with 50,00 people with loaded AK-47s.

Logged

Ignorance is Bliss...

┌┌┌┌┌┌

┌-----┌

┌-----┌

┌┌┌┌┌┌

┌-----┌

┌-----┌

┌-----┌

┌┌┌┌┌┌ loodyBlade

Misanthrope

Frequent poster

A Veritas Regular

\*\*

Posts: 89

Karma: 0

Frequent poster

[View Profile](#)

Godlike abilites?

« Reply #7 on: August 15, 2004, 11:14:31 PM »

Ahh, but if someone with uber psionic powers WERE to try and "take over the world" then they could do it all from home, because if they are that powerful then I doubt they would need to get out of their chair. Thus your Ak-47s are quite useless, right?

Logged

"Do what thou wilt shall be the whole of the law, unless thou wilt not follow the law, in which case don't."

Osiris X

Regular Member

A Veritas Regular

\*\*

Posts: 78

Karma: 0

Regular Member

[View Profile](#)

Godlike abilites?

« Reply #8 on: August 16, 2004, 12:37:31 AM »

Nice 8bit sprite. Looks like something from a mmorpg server. A 2d one ofcourse.  
And one of the first posts was right. If you look at it, we do have god like abilities.  
Maybe they arent god like to our standards, but to other peoples standards, they are.

Logged

Osiris X-Training in Cryokinesis since 2002

Darkstar

Hundred-plus Club

A Familiar Feature

\*\*\*

Posts: 136

Karma: 0

Hundred-plus Club

[View Profile](#)

Godlike abilites?

« Reply #9 on: August 16, 2004, 05:54:05 AM »

Ya we all do have godlike powers. I don't believe in limits and if your strong enough you can do anything you dream of.

Logged

Revelation

inanis

A Familiar Feature

\*\*\*

Posts: 180

Karma: 0

i'm probably the smartest person i know.

[View Profile](#)

Godlike abilites?

« Reply #10 on: August 16, 2004, 09:27:57 PM »

... and then you wake up.

Logged

He who fights with monsters might take care lest he thereby become a monster. And if you gaze for long into an abyss, the abyss gazes also into you.

Silver\_Archer

Prophet of Doom

Veritas Moderator  
Posts By Osmosis

\*\*\*\*\*

Posts: 1368  
Karma: 50

[View Profile](#)

Godlike abilites?

« Reply #11 on: August 16, 2004, 11:21:40 PM »  
and then you wake up. again.

Logged  
ShadowStriker  
Regular Member  
A Familiar Feature  
\*\*\*

Posts: 228  
Karma: 0

All Around WTF

[View Profile](#)

Godlike abilites?

« Reply #12 on: August 17, 2004, 12:01:34 AM »

Hmmm.... imagine the possibilities, if i had godlike powers.....hmmm....thats a tough one, first, i'd find and kill osama bin laden and those terrorists, make those little fu\*\*ers suffer for what they did (and plus im tired of hearing it EVERY FREAKING DAY on the news) and then i'd be like a superhero or something, only except if someone committed a heinous crime (murder or rape) i would spare no mercy. Hey, it may seem harsh, but did they show mercy on their victims? No, so tough sh\*\* for them. And yea, this is IF i had godlike powers so dont yell or make fun of me....

Logged  
The Strong Take From the Weak, The Smart Take From The Strong, The Quick Take From The Smart, And The Weak Rise Up Against Them All

ZoomKnot  
Regular Member  
Settling In  
\*

Posts: 43



Karma: 0

Regular Member

[View Profile](#)

Godlike abilites?

« Reply #13 on: August 17, 2004, 01:44:09 AM »

If had the powers of God, I'd do whatever I wanted to do to get my kicks, eventaully get bored, then actaully do something constructive with my newfound abilities.

Logged

Silver\_Archer

Prophet of Doom

Veritas Moderator

Posts By Osmosis

\*\*\*\*\*

Posts: 1368

Karma: 50

[View Profile](#)

Godlike abilites?

« Reply #14 on: August 17, 2004, 02:36:38 AM »

if I had godlike powers I'd take over the universe and then use all matter as target practice.

Logged

Pages: [1] 2 3 ... 6   [Print](#)

« previous next »

Jump to:

=> [Main Hall](#)

Powered by MySQL Powered by PHP    Powered by SMF 1.1.19 | SMF © 2013, Simple Machines

Oxygen design by Bloc    Valid XHTML 1.0! Valid CSS!

<http://forums.v society.net/index.php?topic=3096.0>

4 captures

7 Jul 2010 - 17 Jul 2014

Sep   JUL   Aug

17

2011   2014   2015

About this capture  
The Veritas Society

\*

\*HomeForumsChatHelpSearchRetroLoginRegister

Welcome, Guest. Please login or register.

Did you miss your activation email?

July 17, 2014, 04:00:36 PM

Forever

Login with username, password and session length

Search:

Advanced search

214965 Posts in 15322 Topics by 19763 Members - Latest Member: - ksyahu    Most  
online today: 132 - most online ever: 430 (June 28, 2007, 02:58:51 PM)

+ The Veritas Society

|-+ The Auditorium

| |-+ Main Hall

|| |-+ Godlike abilites?    0 Members and 1 Guest are viewing this topic. « previous  
next »

Pages: [1] 2 3 ... 6    Print

Author    Topic: Godlike abilites? (Read 10560 times)

Achilles

Greenhorn

New Member

\*

Posts: 9

Karma: 0

Greenhorn

View Profile

Godlike abilites?

« on: August 15, 2004, 03:05:25 PM »

Does anyone here think people have godlike abilites? To do what they want as they  
please, and no one can stop them? What happens if someone like that emerges and

causes something horrible to happen, and something brand new for the world to fear?

Logged

If you never go into battle, then your name will never be remembered...

[/FONT][COLOR][SIZE]

Darkstar

Hundred-plus Club

A Familiar Feature

\*\*\*

Posts: 136

Karma: 0

Hundred-plus Club

[View Profile](#)

Godlike abilities?

« Reply #1 on: August 15, 2004, 03:06:44 PM »

Why wouldn't we? We can change reality, right?

Logged

Osiris X

Regular Member

A Veritas Regular

\*\*

Posts: 78

Karma: 0

Regular Member

[View Profile](#)

Godlike abilities?

« Reply #2 on: August 15, 2004, 03:07:41 PM »

No, sorry to bust your bubble. But anybody can stop somebody. You maybe perfect on one thing, but every man has his weakness.

Logged

Osiris X-Training in Cryokinesis since 2002

Winged\_Wolf

Regular Member

A Familiar Feature

\*\*\*

Posts: 122  
Karma: 0

Regular Member

[View Profile WWW](#)

Godlike abilites?

« Reply #3 on: August 15, 2004, 05:20:03 PM »

Hello, you there up in the stratosphere...come back to the planet. There's a real world here waiting, when you arrive.

It has things like spending 4 years practicing PK so you can occasionally get a ping pong ball to roll across a flat table.

Live with it.

Logged

--Winged Wolf

Get my books:

<http://www.lulu.com/wingedwolfpsion>

The Psion Guild:

<http://www.psionguild.org>

solstice

Dreamwalker

Posts By Osmosis

\*\*\*\*\*

Posts: 2114

Karma: -4

"Receive and transmit..."

[View Profile](#)

Godlike abilites?

« Reply #4 on: August 15, 2004, 06:45:51 PM »

Actually... we all have "god-like" powers, if you consider what people used to think made gods.

But not to burst anyone's bubble, but I have seen a friend of mine soften metal, by looking at it. "Un-stopable" was the exact phrase I used, when I told him he should

practice harder hehe

Logged

Tell all the Truth but tell it slant: Success in Circuit lies. Too bright for our infirm Delight. The Truth's superb surprise. As Lightning to the Children eased, with explanation kind. The Truth must dazzle gradually, or every man be blind.

Tefeari: The Giant Impact Hypothesis is a theory

onikirimaru777

Frequent poster

A Veritas Regular

\*\*

Posts: 80

Karma: 0

Frequent poster

[View Profile](#)

Godlike abilites?

« Reply #5 on: August 15, 2004, 10:19:24 PM »

well, can your god-like abilities beat my pistol Cheesy

\*does the newbie dance of shame\*

Logged

BloodyBlade

Regular Member

Settling In

\*

Posts: 41

Karma: 0

Regular Member

[View Profile](#)

Godlike abilites?

« Reply #6 on: August 15, 2004, 11:07:46 PM »

Hmm... I hope you realize that pistols along with their bullets are made of metal. I truly think that someone with the power to soften metal would desire to destroy the world, or take any of it over. If they did people like us would be there to stop them, along with 50,00 people with loaded AK-47s.

Logged  
Ignorance is Bliss...  
┌┌┌┌┌┌  
┌-----┌  
┌-----┌  
┌┌┌┌┌┌  
┌-----┌  
┌-----┌  
┌-----┌  
┌┌┌┌┌┌ loodyBlade  
Misanthrope  
Frequent poster  
A Veritas Regular  
\*\*  
Posts: 89  
Karma: 0

Frequent poster

[View Profile](#)

Godlike abilites?  
« Reply #7 on: August 15, 2004, 11:14:31 PM »  
Ahh, but if someone with uber psionic powers WERE to try and "take over the world" then they could do it all from home, because if they are that powerful then I doubt they would need to get out of their chair. Thus your Ak-47s are quite useless, right?  
Logged  
"Do what thou wilt shall be the whole of the law, unless thou wilt not follow the law, in which case don't."  
Osiris X  
Regular Member  
A Veritas Regular  
\*\*  
Posts: 78  
Karma: 0

Regular Member

[View Profile](#)

Godlike abilites?

« Reply #8 on: August 16, 2004, 12:37:31 AM »

Nice 8bit sprite. Looks like something from a mmorpg server. A 2d one ofcourse.

And one of the first posts was right. If you look at it, we do have god like abilities.

Maybe they arent god like to our standards, but to other peoples standards, they are.

Logged

Osiris X-Training in Cryokinesis since 2002

Darkstar

Hundred-plus Club

A Familiar Feature

\*\*\*

Posts: 136

Karma: 0

Hundred-plus Club

[View Profile](#)

Godlike abilites?

« Reply #9 on: August 16, 2004, 05:54:05 AM »

Ya we all do have godlike powers. I don't believe in limits and if your strong enough you can do anything you dream of.

Logged

Revelation

inanis

A Familiar Feature

\*\*\*

Posts: 180

Karma: 0

i'm probably the smartest person i know.

[View Profile](#)

Godlike abilites?

« Reply #10 on: August 16, 2004, 09:27:57 PM »

... and then you wake up.

Logged

He who fights with monsters might take care lest he thereby become a monster. And if

you gaze for long into an abyss, the abyss gazes also into you.

Silver\_Archer

Prophet of Doom

Veritas Moderator

Posts By Osmosis

\*\*\*\*\*

Posts: 1368

Karma: 50

[View Profile](#)

Godlike abilites?

« Reply #11 on: August 16, 2004, 11:21:40 PM »

and then you wake up. again.

Logged

ShadowStriker

Regular Member

A Familiar Feature

\*\*\*

Posts: 228

Karma: 0

All Around WTF

[View Profile](#)

Godlike abilites?

« Reply #12 on: August 17, 2004, 12:01:34 AM »

Hmmm.... imagine the possibilities, if i had godlike powers.....hmmm....thats a tough one, first, i'd find and kill osama bin laden and those terrorists, make those little fu\*\*ers suffer for what they did (and plus im tired of hearing it EVERY FREAKING DAY on the news) and then i'd be like a superhero or something, only except if someone committed a heinous crime (murder or rape) i would spare no mercy. Hey, it may seem harsh, but did they show mercy on their victims? No, so tough sh\*\* for them. And yea, this is IF i had godlike powers so dont yell or make fun of me....

Logged

The Strong Take From the Weak, The Smart Take From The Strong, The Quick Take From The Smart, And The Weak Rise Up Against Them All



ZoomKnot  
Regular Member  
Settling In

\*

Posts: 43  
Karma: 0

Regular Member

[View Profile](#)

Godlike abilites?

« Reply #13 on: August 17, 2004, 01:44:09 AM »

If had the powers of God, I'd do whatever I wanted to do to get my kicks, eventaully get bored, then actaully do something constructive with my newfound abilities.

Logged  
Silver\_Archer  
Prophet of Doom  
Veritas Moderator  
Posts By Osmosis

\*\*\*\*\*

Posts: 1368  
Karma: 50

[View Profile](#)

Godlike abilites?

« Reply #14 on: August 17, 2004, 02:36:38 AM »

if I had godlike powers I'd take over the universe and then use all matter as target practice.

Logged  
Pages: [1] 2 3 ... 6   Print  
« previous next »  
Jump to:  
=> Main Hall

<http://forums.vrsociety.net/index.php/topic%2C3096.15.html>

1 capture

01 May 2013

Apr MAY Jun

01

2012 2013 2014

About this capture

The Veritas Society

\*

\*HomeForumsChatHelpSearchRetroLoginRegister

Welcome, Guest. Please login or register.

Did you miss your activation email?

April 30, 2013, 07:14:44 PM

Forever

Login with username, password and session length

Search:

Advanced search

207359 Posts in 14734 Topics by 18410 Members - Latest Member: - MindDisciple

Most online today: 98 - most online ever: 430 (June 28, 2007, 02:58:51 PM)

+ The Veritas Society

|-+ The Auditorium

| |-+ Main Hall

|| |-+ Godlike abilites? 0 Members and 1 Guest are viewing this topic. « previous  
next »

Pages: 1 [2] 3 4 ... 6Print

Author Topic: Godlike abilites? (Read 9780 times)

The Gunslinger

Frequent poster

A Familiar Feature

\*\*\*

Posts: 109

Karma: 1

Frequent poster

View Profile

Godlike abilites?

« Reply #15 on: August 17, 2004, 04:23:39 AM »

If i had god-like powers. I think i'd start off with good intentions, then eventually think i was pretty hot shit and rule with an iron fist. After all I'm stronger than everyone, why should they disagree with me, I THE ALL POWERFUL truely know best. Damn humans and their ego, this is the exact reason i think we don't have god like powers, becuae those that do, work for it, and truely have the disipline needed to control such things.

Logged

"Better in one ecstatic epic day

To strike a blow for glory and for truth,

With ardent singing heart to toss away

In freedom's holy cause my eager youth,

Than bear as weary years pass one by one

The knowledge of a scared task undone."

{-----}

A man who runs in front of a truck gets tired.

A man who runs behind a truck gets exusted.

--Ancient Chinese Proverb

Frozen

Posting chief

Veritas Moderator

Posts By Osmosis

\*\*\*\*\*

Posts: 1072

Karma: 0

Posting chief

[View Profile](#)

Godlike abilites?

« Reply #16 on: August 17, 2004, 04:36:20 AM »

This is why we're not ALLOWED to have god-like powers... we'd basically just walk around being all great and good and then get bored.... and boredom does bad things. For example...

Ooh look at that new building

Yep, it's a real masterpiece.

\*BOOM!\*

Logged

\* chirss was kicked by kobok (Denny Crane)

I CARVE EVERYTHING YOU SAY INTO MY LEFT ARM!  
~ V

<ShoresofPluto> how often do u ignite fires with ur mind?  
<kobok> On occasion.

[20:06] <kobok> XIII: You wear your girlfriend's pants??

[20:06] <XIII> kobok: On occasion.

Enlightenment

Has a lot of posts

Veritas Furniture

\*\*\*\*

Posts: 358

Karma: 0

Has a lot of posts

[View Profile WWW](#)

Godlike abilites?

« Reply #17 on: August 17, 2004, 06:14:47 AM »

I'd go off emitting horrible tortures on the varying groups of people that I hate, then when they die emit the same torture only for eternity! And those people would be...

Rapists

Terrorists and/or Bullies to little kids (it's the same damn thing really tongue.)

Feminazis and Shouvanists (I'm male..but personally I cannot stand either group of people..just feminazis more because I guess it's more personal to me.)

Racists

People who lie

People who cheat on one another

People who use others for their own personal gain

People who harm each other for nothing more than the sick kick of doing so

People who act in previous manners yet are proud of it.

Yep..I'd be one very, VERY unforgiving and biased God, who held grudges..^\_^.

Be Well.

Logged

En: Get into a class.

Preferably a Hatha Yoga class.

Avoid Yogas  
Power Yoga, Fitness yoga, Wellness Yoga, Energy Yoga.....  
What about NINJA SEX YOGA!!! Is that alright?

Tsu: No Tongue

ROFL

Faijer

Existential Pragmatist

Veritas Moderator

Posts By Osmosis

\*\*\*\*\*

Posts: 3199

Karma: 41

The Devil's Advocate

[View Profile WWW](#)

Godlike abilites?

« Reply #18 on: August 17, 2004, 08:18:18 AM »

Enlightenment, I believe that list is called The Human Genocide List...

Logged

My WordPress Blog is updated regularly.

NEW UPDATE: Life begins at conception: A thought experiment (29/08/2012)

Orthas

Veritas Archivist

Posts By Osmosis

\*\*\*\*\*

Posts: 574

Karma: 1

Page of Cups

[View Profile](#)

Godlike abilites?

« Reply #19 on: August 17, 2004, 09:48:22 AM »

would it be that good to have god powers and use them to rule etc. After all you would be the only person, you wouldn't be the same as everyone else, so you would live an eternity of lonliness and rule over a people who are constantly looking for an oppotunity to get rid of you. You might be happy for a while and then it will wear off and you'l want

something else, it would end up being an eternity of loneliness and unhappiness, after all your minds still human, and what we crave is acceptance and friendship (I assume) being different like that would remove all possibility of acceptance.

Logged

“And you shall drink your cup alone, though it taste of blood and tears, and praise God for the gift of taste.” -Almustafa, Garden of the Prophet.

Quid quid latine dictum sit, altum videtur

Darkstar  
Hundred-plus Club  
A Familiar Feature

\*\*\*

Posts: 136

Karma: 0

Hundred-plus Club

[View Profile](#)

Godlike abilities?

« Reply #20 on: August 17, 2004, 09:50:49 AM »

Quote from: Frozen

This is why we're not ALLOWED to have god-like powers... we'd basically just walk around being all great and good and then get bored.... and boredom does bad things. For example...

Ooh look at that new building

Yep, it's a real masterpiece.

\*BOOM!\*

Who ever said we aren't allowed to have god powers? You? If you work hard enough you can have godlike powers and it is possible to become immortal. Everything is possible.

Logged

kakkarot

0. The Fool... Inverted?

Posts By Osmosis

\*\*\*\*\*

Posts: 2701

Karma: 3

Pirate "Not-A-Mod" BoB

[View Profile](#)

Godlike abilites?

« Reply #21 on: August 17, 2004, 10:18:18 AM »

I've moved this because it isn't a discussion about Psionics specifically, but about metaphysical ability in a very vague and general sense. I moved it here instead of Other because it's mostly a "what-if" type question, but I didn't move it to the Pool because it's soliciting mature responses Smiley.

~kakkarot

Logged

Philippians 2:5 Your attitude should be the same as that of Christ Jesus: 6 Who, being in very nature God, did not consider equality with God something to be grasped, 7 but made himself nothing, taking the very nature of a servant, being made in human likeness.

Faijer

Existential Pragmatist

Veritas Moderator

Posts By Osmosis

\*\*\*\*\*

Posts: 3199

Karma: 41

The Devil's Advocate

[View Profile WWW](#)

Godlike abilites?

« Reply #22 on: August 17, 2004, 11:01:21 AM »

\*eats kakkarot\* MaTuRe mY aSs!!! !crotchkick kakkarot

Cheesy Joking

Quote from: Darkstar

If you work hard enough you can have godlike powers and it is possible to become immortal. Everything is possible.

Immortality in the sense of physically living forever, doesn't seem possible for biological reasons, and it doesn't seem like it would be wise to get rid of them, because our bodies may still age within the same time period (i.e, you may still be like any other 80 year old at 80, but if you live for thousand years, imagine how frail your body could become). That said, I would like to point out that immortality is living forever, and by forever, I mean no matter what, it grants you an invulnerable body as well. Immortal life is a bit more realistically attainable on a physical level, because otherwise you would have to be immune to all poisons, have an indestructable body, be able to breathe in space (or just not suffocate ever), etc etc etc.

However immortality itself has come to be more on the level of the person themselves and not the shell they appear in physically. Memories. Everyone remembers Bruce Lee, everyone remembers Julius Ceasar. As long as people remember them, they will live forever in our memories. Bruce Lee actually said it at some point (don't remember when) - "The first step to immortality is leading a life worth remembering". That doesn't imply you have to be famous and a hero, just lead a life that wasn't vain, egocentric and self-serving (anyone remember the Inquisitor from Red Dwarf? He wanted to purge the Universe of those kinds of people).

So immortality has already been done. Why do I disagree with your statement, because it holds in it the phrase 'godlike powers', which leads me to believe you mean living forever, thus, I disagree with that kind of immortality becoming a reality (because I also pick up the implication you believe it's possible for someone of our generation to do it in their lifetime). However, I do apologise if you are not referring to that kind and indeed the society kind.

Godlike powers however, is different, because it is almost impossible to have them. Okay, yes, we have godlike things compared to 500 years ago... But we are not situated 500 years ago, we are situated in this time, this age, and there isn't anyone here who has what would be considered now as godlike powers. Maybe someone 500 years away will have what we consider godlike powers, but in their own time, will they be considered godlike? Probably not.

I'm done.

Logged

My WordPress Blog is updated regularly.

NEW UPDATE: Life begins at conception: A thought experiment (29/08/2012)

Orthas

Veritas Archivist

Posts By Osmosis

\*\*\*\*\*

Posts: 574

Karma: 1



Page of Cups

[View Profile](#)

Godlike abilites?

« Reply #23 on: August 17, 2004, 12:05:16 PM »

there are other immortality's as well, through family, your seed living on. And immortality in an afterlife, to add.

Logged

"And you shall drink your cup alone, though it taste of blood and tears, and praise God for the gift of taste." -Almustafa, Garden of the Prophet.

Quid quid latine dictum sit, altum videtur

Smiffy

He's Smiffarific

Posts By Osmosis

\*\*\*\*\*

Posts: 671

Karma: 1

Riding in with a Cow, a Sofa and a Keg of Bleaer..

[View Profile](#)

Godlike abilites?

« Reply #24 on: August 17, 2004, 03:02:50 PM »

if i had godlike powers i'd probably blow stuff up, then fix it with my powers and then blow it up again.

i'm easily amused.

Logged

<Tsumaru> STFU RAITARO, I SHALL DESTROY THEE

\* Raitaro pats tsu

<Raitaro> So cute <3

Frozen

Posting chief

Veritas Moderator

Posts By Osmosis

\*\*\*\*\*

Posts: 1072  
Karma: 0

Posting chief

[View Profile](#)

Godlike abilites?

« Reply #25 on: August 18, 2004, 12:58:28 PM »

Smiffy, some sanity was actually starting to sprout in this thread... and you killed it!

Logged

\* chirss was kicked by kobok (Denny Crane)

I CARVE EVERYTHING YOU SAY INTO MY LEFT ARM!

~ V

<ShoresofPluto> how often do u ignite fires with ur mind?

<kobok> On occasion.

[20:06] <kobok> XIII: You wear your girlfriend's pants??

[20:06] <XIII> kobok: On occasion.

Smiffy

He's Smiffarific

Posts By Osmosis

\*\*\*\*\*

Posts: 671

Karma: 1

Riding in with a Cow, a Sofa and a Keg of Bleaer..

[View Profile](#)

Godlike abilites?

« Reply #26 on: August 18, 2004, 01:25:30 PM »

lol, sorry. they'll probably ignore my post and continue with their sane stuff.

Logged

<Tsumaru> STFU RAITARO, I SHALL DESTROY THEE

\* Raitaro pats tsu

<Raitaro> So cute <3

Faijer  
Existential Pragmatist  
Veritas Moderator  
Posts By Osmosis  
\*\*\*\*\*

Posts: 3199  
Karma: 41

The Devil's Advocate

[View Profile WWW](#)

Godlike abilites?

« Reply #27 on: August 18, 2004, 01:35:28 PM »

Frozen: Smiffy hasn't posted here, it's you that's bringing insanity here Cheesy  
Logged

My WordPress Blog is updated regularly.

NEW UPDATE: Life begins at conception: A thought experiment (29/08/2012)

Smiffy

He's Smiffarific

Posts By Osmosis  
\*\*\*\*\*

Posts: 671  
Karma: 1

Riding in with a Cow, a Sofa and a Keg of Bleaer..

[View Profile](#)

Godlike abilites?

« Reply #28 on: August 18, 2004, 02:45:46 PM »

yeah, see its the simple thing of people only see what they want to see.

hmm, since they can't see me....

\*steal's talyn's smiley\*

\* Cheesy <---stolen smiley\*

Logged

<Tsumaru> STFU RAITARO, I SHALL DESTROY THEE

\* Raitaro pats tsu

<Raitaro> So cute <3

\_jujitsu\_  
Veritas Furniture  
Veritas Furniture  
\*\*\*\*

Posts: 263  
Karma: 1

Veritas Furniture

[View Profile](#)

Godlike abilites?

« Reply #29 on: August 18, 2004, 04:58:29 PM »

Quote from: Frozen

This is why we're not ALLOWED to have god-like powers... we'd basically just walk around being all great and good and then get bored.... and boredom does bad things. For example...

Ooh look at that new building

Yep, it's a real masterpiece.

\*BOOM!\*

Ha ha, i've actually done that in a dream before, only it was an entire city not just one building. Oh well, there goes the dream of becoming a god rolleyes

To Talyn: if people 500 years from now work out a means of scientific physical time travel or scientifically enhancing humans, then i'd say they could be said to hold godlike abilities, as not everyone will have access to it. Not everyone even has access to radio or electricity in the world at present and those technologies have been around for ages and are relatively simple compared to timetravel. In saying that fire is relatively simple compared electricity but they were both just as impressive when they first came out, and those things can be found naturally in nature - the sun and lightning.

Logged

One night I was a butterfly, fluttering happily around.

Then i awoke, and found that I was a man.

But what am I in truth?

A man who dreams he is a butterfly,[/colo

Pages: 1 [2] 3 4 ... 6Print

« previous next »

Jump to:

=> Main Hall

Powered by MySQL Powered by PHP Powered by SMF 1.1.18 | SMF © 2013, Simple Machines

Oxygen design by Bloc Valid XHTML 1.0! Valid CSS!

<http://forums.vociety.net/index.php/topic%2C3096.30.html>

1 capture

30 Apr 2013

Mar APR May

30

2012 2013 2014

About this capture

The Veritas Society

\*

\*HomeForumsChatHelpSearchRetroLoginRegister

Welcome, Guest. Please login or register.

Did you miss your activation email?

April 30, 2013, 06:56:59 AM

Forever

Login with username, password and session length

Search:

Advanced search

207348 Posts in 14733 Topics by 18410 Members - Latest Member: - MindDisciple

Most online today: 95 - most online ever: 430 (June 28, 2007, 02:58:51 PM)

+ The Veritas Society

|-+ The Auditorium

| |-+ Main Hall

|| |-+ Godlike abilites? 0 Members and 1 Guest are viewing this topic. « previous  
next »

Pages: 1 2 [3] 4 5 6 Print

Author Topic: Godlike abilites? (Read 9764 times)

kakkarot

0. The Fool... Inverted?

Posts By Osmosis

\*\*\*\*\*

Posts: 2701

Karma: 3

Pirate "Not-A-Mod" BoB

[View Profile](#)

Godlike abilites?

« Reply #30 on: August 18, 2004, 05:29:35 PM »

"any sufficiently advanced technology is indistinguishable from magic".

our technology today would likely make us seem as gods to ancient races. though also remember that even the ancient races believed that gods could die, but that they were so much more powerful than regular mortals that it was normally believed to take another god to do it.

so, perhaps we are gods already? Smiley ("god" being a subjective term and all ^\_^)

~kakkarot

Logged

Philippians 2:5 Your attitude should be the same as that of Christ Jesus: 6 Who, being in very nature God, did not consider equality with God something to be grasped, 7 but made himself nothing, taking the very nature of a servant, being made in human likeness.

Faijer

Existential Pragmatist

Veritas Moderator

Posts By Osmosis

\*\*\*\*\*

Posts: 3199

Karma: 41

The Devil's Advocate

[View Profile WWW](#)

Godlike abilites?

« Reply #31 on: August 19, 2004, 03:52:41 AM »

\_jujitsu\_: True, very true. However I believe that in 500 years, pretty much everyone will be more advanced than we are now, so we would consider them gods. But as you say, there may be people in their society that they hold as gods because of their superiority. However, go anothe 500 years down the line, now we're 1000 years into the future, who's to say that everyone won't then possess those abilities? Then it will be normal. It's an endless cycle of power to the individual rather than the race as a whole. That is what

I believe 'godlike' should refer to, not the comparison of time and saying the human race are all gods compared to 500 years ago. So yes, I agree with you.

Only in the opinions of those ancient races kakkarot, I have just as much power as you do in theory, because we are both from the same civilisation. And I don't consider you a god, because of that fact.

Logged

My WordPress Blog is updated regularly.

NEW UPDATE: Life begins at conception: A thought experiment (29/08/2012)

Rafnul!

he-who-posts-lots

Posts By Osmosis

\*\*\*\*\*

Posts: 1064

Karma: 24

[View Profile](#)

Godlike abilites?

« Reply #32 on: August 19, 2004, 06:09:40 AM »

Quote from: Osiris X

Nice 8bit sprite. Looks like something from a mmorpg server. A 2d one ofcourse.

Final Fantasy (Original NES) Red Mage.

If I have a plasma cutter, with which I can cut metal like butter, does it protect me from flying bullets? No... there's more to the physics than simple potentials. I would have to touch the bullet for more than 1/568 of a second to do anything to it. And besides, while some people can just barely catch slow-moving shot from a shotgun fly through the air, being able to look at a bullet as it is flying in order to "melt" it... would be quite difficult.

Now, I grant to you, that it may be possible to alter reality as quickly on as large a scale as desired, but I do believe that there is not yet one among us who has learned to tap abilities of that magnitude.

Logged

kakkarot

0. The Fool... Inverted?

Posts By Osmosis

\*\*\*\*\*

Posts: 2701

Karma: 3

Pirate "Not-A-Mod" BoB

[View Profile](#)

Godlike abilites?

« Reply #33 on: August 19, 2004, 10:47:16 AM »

soft, melted, or solid, lead flying at you at more than Mach 1 isn't going to be pretty when it impacts Smiley.

~kakkarot

Logged

Philippians 2:5 Your attitude should be the same as that of Christ Jesus: 6 Who, being in very nature God, did not consider equality with God something to be grasped, 7 but made himself nothing, taking the very nature of a servant, being made in human likeness.

Faijer

Existential Pragmatist

Veritas Moderator

Posts By Osmosis

\*\*\*\*\*

Posts: 3199

Karma: 41

The Devil's Advocate

[View Profile WWW](#)

Godlike abilites?

« Reply #34 on: August 19, 2004, 10:51:18 AM »

Anything visible to the naked eye hitting you at Mach 1 wouldn't be pretty on impact tongue

Logged

My WordPress Blog is updated regularly.

NEW UPDATE: Life begins at conception: A thought experiment (29/08/2012)

Dovienya

Regular Member



A Veritas Regular

\*\*

Posts: 58

Karma: 0

Regular Member

[View Profile](#)

Godlike abilites?

« Reply #35 on: August 19, 2004, 05:08:53 PM »

Well, it's in my personal opinion that if some lucky person got powerz like that...They would recreate the Earth after they had some fun and then got bored... Then, if it happened once, someone else would "get God", and re-recreate the Earth... rinse and repeat. Cheesy

Logged

I sit upon my stone pedestal,

And watch the faces streaming by.

erre

Greenhorn

New Member

\*

Posts: 1

Karma: 0

Greenhorn

[View Profile](#)

Godlike abilites?

« Reply #36 on: August 20, 2004, 10:46:50 AM »

What if we (OEC) continued to be a more or less secret group, and the rest of humanity would develop as normal, while we would get better and better training methods, developing our skills through our entire lives, and teaching it to our children? Then the people of the OEC 500 years from now would be godlike to the rest of humanity, though not godlike to the other practitioners! That would be a nice trick to "fool" the rule...

(Ops, I'm at a friends house, and logged in as him... I'm really Murray.)

Logged

Nightmare

Greenhorn  
Settling In

\*

Posts: 11  
Karma: 0

[View Profile](#)

Godlike abilites?

« Reply #37 on: August 20, 2004, 02:23:10 PM »

If we had the capacity for "god-like" abilities then we wouldn't be exactly human. It would mean everyone was a god but were just to lazy to use their powers or whatever. But oh well Smiley Who said we had to obey rules or capacities?

Logged

"Give one fish and he's fed for only a day. Teach one how to fish and he'll be free from hunger all his life."

Lightbringer

Has a lot of posts

Posts By Osmosis

\*\*\*\*\*

Posts: 793  
Karma: 0

Spiritual Warrior

[View Profile](#)

Godlike abilites?

« Reply #38 on: August 20, 2004, 05:07:40 PM »

People with god-like abilities prefer to keep their actions subtle and watch from the sidelines (I know because I am godlike tongue).

Logged

The thing that really fascinates me about people is their ability to have no idea what's going on even though it's going on in plain sight all around them and the even more amazing tendency to argue violently when one of these obvious things is presented to them.

Neti Neti

he-who-posts-lots

Veritas Furniture

\*\*\*\*\*

Posts: 363

Karma: 1

he-who-posts-lots

[View Profile WWW](#)

Godlike abilites?

« Reply #39 on: August 21, 2004, 08:35:12 AM »

He's Right you know.

Logged

People only see what they are prepared to see.

Give all to love; obey thy heart.

Insist on yourself; never imitate... Every great man is unique.

Nothing can bring you peace but yourself.

Speak what you think today in words as hard as cannon-balls and tomorrow speak what tomorrow thinks in hard words again, though it contradict every thing you said today.[/I]

Ralph Waldo Emerson

Place Of Heart Board

kakkarot

0. The Fool... Inverted?

Posts By Osmosis

\*\*\*\*\*

Posts: 2701

Karma: 3

Pirate "Not-A-Mod" BoB

[View Profile](#)

Godlike abilites?

« Reply #40 on: August 21, 2004, 12:47:05 PM »

Murray: The occult "community" HAS been in existence for thousands of years, yet I highly doubt that the most advanced practitioners today are much better, if at all better, than the ancients.

back to general topic: Not to mention that being with "god like powers" DO exist today... they're called gods. Most people think that because gods are part of religions that they don't exist cause "religions are crap", but not all religions came about from people worshipping their bowls and cups.

I don't follow any religion and am even breaking away from calling myself christian (haven't ever followed the /christian religion/ but did follow the ideas of the christ), yet I still have a healthy respect (though not necessarily "liking") for any being with enough power that they can accumulate thousands of followers (or tens of thousands, or hundreds of thousands, or ... etc) and get away with calling themselves a god.

As Kalee's sig says (or once said): "You do not believe what you do not live" Smiley.

~kakkarot

Logged

Philippians 2:5 Your attitude should be the same as that of Christ Jesus: 6 Who, being in very nature God, did not consider equality with God something to be grasped, 7 but made himself nothing, taking the very nature of a servant, being made in human likeness.

Murray

Veritas Furniture

Veritas Furniture

\*\*\*\*

Posts: 379

Karma: -1

Pull my finger, I'm an Aikidoka

[View Profile](#)

Godlike abilities?

« Reply #41 on: August 22, 2004, 12:02:00 PM »

Lightbringer: People who are "Godlike" prefer to play Unreal Tournament. Duh.

Logged

"A dream where I slowly suck out a clown's vital organs with a hoover is a GOOD DREAM!"

- Darkduck

Lightbringer

Has a lot of posts  
Posts By Osmosis

\*\*\*\*\*

Posts: 793  
Karma: 0

Spiritual Warrior

[View Profile](#)

Godlike abilites?

« Reply #42 on: August 22, 2004, 07:07:26 PM »

Quote from: Murray

Lightbringer: People who are "Godlike" prefer to play Unreal Tournament. Duh.

\*Dies laughing\*

Logged

The thing that really fascinates me about people is their ability to have no idea what's going on even though it's going on in plain sight all around them and the even more amazing tendency to argue violently when one of these obvious things is presented to them.

Neo

Veritas Furniture

A Familiar Feature

\*\*\*

Posts: 164  
Karma: 0

Veritas Furniture

[View Profile](#)

Godlike abilites?

« Reply #43 on: August 30, 2004, 06:31:21 AM »

Imao, the most "godlike" power I know of would have to be astral projection, I mean, you can go and soften your spoons and spill your shreddies down your shirt, or you could be out and about knowing all,. pretty godlike, and pretty anomomys (damned spelling) I think I could be right in saying that with astral projection and a nice comp, you could

take down anyone that is connected to the internet, dunno why, but you could.

Logged

Don't annoy me, or I'll set my kamehamehamsters on you!

Nekodaimyo

Veritas Furniture

A Familiar Feature

\*\*\*

Posts: 205

Karma: 0

Veritas Furniture

View Profile

Godlike abilites?

« Reply #44 on: August 31, 2004, 07:32:33 PM »

People can do what ever they want with complete disregard and in a way are god like, but everybody could do that if they wanted the thing is; you can't do that without reprecussions.

So partially you are right that in god's image man can do as he pleases, but he'll have to deal with the consequences.

By the way, why have you started this post, are you afraid of a "superior being" wreaking havoc amongst us?

Logged

世界の支配者と言われると、お世辞でもうれしい。

Pages: 1 2 [3] 4 5 6 Print

« previous next »

Jump to:

=> Main Hall

Powered by MySQL Powered by PHP Powered by SMF 1.1.18 | SMF © 2013, Simple Machines

Oxygen design by Bloc Valid XHTML 1.0! Valid CSS!

<http://forums.v society.net/index.php/topic%2C3096.45.html>

1 capture

25 Apr 2013

Mar APR May

25

2012 2013 2014

About this capture

The Veritas Society

\*

[\\*Home](#)[Forums](#)[Chat](#)[Help](#)[Search](#)[Retro](#)[Login](#)[Register](#)  
Welcome, Guest. Please login or register.  
Did you miss your activation email?  
April 24, 2013, 09:19:09 PM

Forever

Login with username, password and session length  
Search:

Advanced search

207187 Posts in 14721 Topics by 18393 Members - Latest Member: - combloaf42  
Most online today: 94 - most online ever: 430 (June 28, 2007, 02:58:51 PM)

+ The Veritas Society

| -+ The Auditorium

| | -+ Main Hall

| | | -+ Godlike abilites? 0 Members and 1 Guest are viewing this topic. « previous  
next »

Pages: 1 2 3 [4] 5 6 Print

Author Topic: Godlike abilites? (Read 9746 times)

lightningmagic

Greenhorn

New Member

\*

Posts: 3

Karma: 0

Greenhorn

View Profile WWW

Godlike abilites?

« Reply #45 on: November 19, 2004, 02:03:00 PM »

The only one with godlike powers is God himself. Of the Christian religion. I believe all religions with gods, are either fake gods, or originate from the Christian religion. Thats all. You die, you go to heaven/hell thats it. No "Grid" no "Matrix" no super powers or shit like that. thats it and thats all. Unless someone can prove 50% of the world different. Thats the way it is. Sorry to burst ur bubble dude....

Lance.....

Logged

For immortality, click here. I know how.

XeYe

Greenhorn

Settling In

\*

Posts: 23

Karma: 0

Greenhorn

[View Profile](#)

Godlike abilites?

« Reply #46 on: November 19, 2004, 03:57:37 PM »

Not to change the subject or anything...but lightningmagic, if you are referring to the world as being 50% Christian, you may have your facts wrong. From a pie chart and statistical table done by the U.S. Center for World Mission (Mission Frontiers.org) made in 2000, 33% of the world is Christian and decreasing.

Back on topic, that's a rather close-minded way of thinking you got there. Your opinion is just as respected as the next. What you say is not the "be all, end all". I think you should have just a little more religious tolerance than that.

Hell, religion in itself is an illogical idea, which goes against the "logical" reasoning that we as humans claim to have. Who is to say that one is or is not godlike. I think it's all a matter of perception, much like everything else in life.

Logged

To mold the mind and body,

To cultivate a vigorous spirit,

And through correct and rigid training,

To strive for Improvement in the art of Kendo;

To hold in esteem human courtesy and honor,

To associate with others with sincerity,

And to forever pursue the cultivation of oneself.

Thus will one be able to love his country and society,

To contribute to the development of culture,

And to promote peace and prosperity among all people.

Misanthrope

Frequent poster

A Veritas Regular

\*\*

Posts: 89

Karma: 0



Frequent poster

[View Profile](#)

Godlike abilites?

« Reply #47 on: November 19, 2004, 04:20:58 PM »

Quote from: lightningmagic

The only one with godlike powers is God himself. Of the Christian religion. I believe all religions with gods, are either fake gods, or orriginate from the Christian religion. Thats all. You die, you go to heaven/hell thats it. No "Grid" no "Matrix" no super powers or shit like that. thats it and thats all. Unless someone can prove 50% of the world different. Thats the way it is. Sorry to burst ur bubble dude....

Lance.....

Congratulations Lance! You're 100% right. Us heathens are going to hell, every one of us, unless we can prove to 50% of the world that we're not horribly deluded, insane individuals.

God really has it out for us with that whole "They go to hell if they don't prove to EXACTLY half (no more, no less) of the world that they can really do what they say" scheme.

Logged

"Do what thou wilt shall be the whole of the law, unless thou wilt not follow the law, in which case don't."

ThiefDeath

Posting chief

Posts By Osmosis

\*\*\*\*\*

Posts: 1544

Karma: 4

Grammaton Cleric

[View Profile](#)

Godlike abilites?

« Reply #48 on: November 19, 2004, 08:14:39 PM »

Are you using the name Lance in a negative connotation? Because if you are, I'm

going to kick your ass.

Anyway, godlike powers? Why be godlike when you can be WICKED SICK?

Logged

[23:48] <DanielH> You guys are all strange

[23:48] <DanielH> You have a different way of thinking (which is wrong)

How about a shave?

Neti Neti

he-who-posts-lots

Veritas Furniture

\*\*\*\*

Posts: 363

Karma: 1

he-who-posts-lots

View Profile WWW

Godlike abilites?

« Reply #49 on: November 19, 2004, 08:46:35 PM »

God like is cool. God is even better though.

Artificial and the actual thing. I personally like artificial bacon bits, but thats just because  
Im a vegetarian :-p

Logged

People only see what they are prepared to see.

Give all to love; obey thy heart.

Insist on yourself; never imitate... Every great man is unique.

Nothing can bring you peace but yourself.

Speak what you think today in words as hard as cannon-balls and tomorrow speak what  
tomorrow thinks in hard words again, though it contradict every thing you said today.[/I]  
Ralph Waldo Emerson

Place Of Heart Board

ThiefDeath

Posting chief

Posts By Osmosis

\*\*\*\*\*

Posts: 1544  
Karma: 4

Grammaton Cleric

[View Profile](#)

Godlike abilites?

« Reply #50 on: November 19, 2004, 08:54:44 PM »  
There's no god in Ut2004. There's only

Killing Spree

Rampage

Dominating

Unstoppable

Godlike

Wicked Sick <-- me Wink

Logged

[23:48] <DanielH> You guys are all strange

[23:48] <DanielH> You have a different way of thinking (which is wrong)

How about a shave?

Neti Neti

he-who-posts-lots

Veritas Furniture

\*\*\*\*

Posts: 363

Karma: 1

he-who-posts-lots

[View Profile WWW](#)

Godlike abilites?

« Reply #51 on: November 19, 2004, 10:03:23 PM »

Quote from: ThiefDeath

There's no god in Ut2004. There's only

Killing Spree

Rampage

Dominating  
Unstoppable  
Godlike  
Wicked Sick     <-- me Wink

lol who was talking about Ut2004? tongue  
Logged  
People only see what they are prepared to see.

Give all to love; obey thy heart.

Insist on yourself; never imitate... Every great man is unique.

Nothing can bring you peace but yourself.

Speak what you think today in words as hard as cannon-balls and tomorrow speak what tomorrow thinks in hard words again, though it contradict every thing you said today.[/l]  
Ralph Waldo Emerson

Place Of Heart Board  
kakkarot  
0. The Fool... Inverted?  
Posts By Osmosis  
\*\*\*\*\*

Posts: 2701  
Karma: 3

Pirate "Not-A-Mod" BoB

[View Profile](#)

Godlike abilites?  
« Reply #52 on: November 20, 2004, 09:02:03 AM »  
lightning magic: the term god refers to a vast number of different entities who are "very powerful".

There are religions and beliefs which hold that there is only one god in the universe, monotheism, and there are religions and beliefs which hold that there are multiple gods in the universe, polytheism, and there are religions and beliefs which hold that there is no god in the universe, atheism, and there are even religions and philosophies and logicians which hold that the nature of gods cannot be truly ascertained and can only be theorized about, agnosticism.

agnosticism, by it's definition and the nature of reality, is the truest for anyone and everyone who has never met a god (that is, any vastly powerful being; powerful enough that us mortals cannot liken ourselves as peers with them).

~kakkarot

Logged

Philippians 2:5 Your attitude should be the same as that of Christ Jesus: 6 Who, being in very nature God, did not consider equality with God something to be grasped, 7 but made himself nothing, taking the very nature of a servant, being made in human likeness.

ThiefDeath

Posting chief

Posts By Osmosis

\*\*\*\*\*

Posts: 1544

Karma: 4

Grammaton Cleric

[View Profile](#)

Godlike abilites?

« Reply #53 on: November 21, 2004, 02:04:54 AM »

\*shoots god with lightning gun. Heaad Shhhot! Smiley\*

[God's Killing Spree Ended by ThiefDeath!!]

God is no longer godlike. Muhahahahaha.

Logged

[23:48] <DanielH> You guys are all strange

[23:48] <DanielH> You have a different way of thinking (which is wrong)

How about a shave?

Lightbringer

Has a lot of posts

Posts By Osmosis

\*\*\*\*\*

Posts: 793

Karma: 0

Spiritual Warrior

[View Profile](#)

Godlike abilites?

« Reply #54 on: November 21, 2004, 03:03:48 PM »

\*Watches god get headshot x20 in a few moments (most of which are on thiefdeath)\*

He's god, did you expect anything less? Tongue

Logged

The thing that really fascinates me about people is their ability to have no idea what's going on even though it's going on in plain sight all around them and the even more amazing tendency to argue violently when one of these obvious things is presented to them.

ThiefDeath

Posting chief

Posts By Osmosis

\*\*\*\*\*

Posts: 1544

Karma: 4

Grammaton Cleric

[View Profile](#)

Godlike abilites?

« Reply #55 on: November 21, 2004, 06:46:21 PM »

No, nobody can do that! He must be using an AIM BOT! CHEATER! \*points at god\*

Logged

[23:48] <DanielH> You guys are all strange

[23:48] <DanielH> You have a different way of thinking (which is wrong)

How about a shave?

Neti Neti

he-who-posts-lots

Veritas Furniture

\*\*\*\*\*

Posts: 363

Karma: 1

he-who-posts-lots

[View Profile WWW](#)

Godlike abilites?

« Reply #56 on: November 21, 2004, 07:18:09 PM »

MAWHahahahahahaha

Logged

People only see what they are prepared to see.

Give all to love; obey thy heart.

Insist on yourself; never imitate... Every great man is unique.

Nothing can bring you peace but yourself.

Speak what you think today in words as hard as cannon-balls and tomorrow speak what tomorrow thinks in hard words again, though it contradict every thing you said today.[/I]  
Ralph Waldo Emerson

Place Of Heart Board

Daemon

Regular Member

A Veritas Regular

\*\*

Posts: 55

Karma: 0

Regular Member

[View Profile](#)

Godlike abilites?

« Reply #57 on: November 25, 2004, 09:20:18 AM »

(Happy turkey day to all)

If you think about it for a second...yes it is true, we do have god like abilities, but to others these abilities are normal...defeating the "god-like" term.. there is always a bigger fish in the sea, hence what you have, someone has better, its just the way the world works..unfortunately all we have , tk, tp, rv, and all that other stuff thats often practiced, has been dormant for ages...and lost its purpose..now we have satalites and stuff, we actually get up to pick up a pencil from the floor, not try to use our mind...and have a

decent conversation with a person instead of prying the layers of their consciousness looking for a simple answer....all of this is fun to do and such...but in the end...there isn't a need...the "god-like" people aren't around, it's only humans and what we make of the world.....

Logged

One who loves his life, will lose it...one who despises his life, will keep it for all eternity.

Rafnul!

he-who-posts-lots

Posts By Osmosis

\*\*\*\*\*

Posts: 1063

Karma: 23

[View Profile](#)

Godlike abilities?

« Reply #58 on: November 25, 2004, 10:03:22 AM »

Quote from: kakkarot

agnosticism, by its definition and the nature of reality, is the truest for anyone and everyone who has never met a god (that is, any vastly powerful being; powerful enough that us mortals cannot liken ourselves as peers with them).

And you've touched precisely on the reason I am not agnostic.

Logged

«Q»

Veritas Furniture

A Familiar Feature

\*\*\*

Posts: 209

Karma: 0

[Veritas Furniture](#)

[View Profile](#)

Godlike abilities?

« Reply #59 on: November 25, 2004, 04:02:10 PM »

There is basically only one person in recorded history who had godlike powers, and



made a public display of it.

There are stories in every cultures of those who could work miracles, but in most cases these were occult abilities, hidden away from the world, and shown to a chosen few in times of necessity.

To my knowledge, there is is only one man in recorded history who had godlike powers, claimed to be godlike, made a public show of his abilities, and flaunted them against the establishment of the time. Things didn't go well for him, strictly speaking- he ended up dead on a tree, though that wasn't the end of him per se.

Quote from: XeYe

Not to change the subject or anything...but lightningmagic, if you are referring to the world as being 50% Christian, you may have your facts wrong. From a pie chart and statistical table done by the U.S. Center for World Mission (Mission Frontiers.org) made in 2000, 33% of the world is Christian and decreasing.

Even that's being a bit generous. There's around a billion or so Christians; and six or seven billion people.

Quote

Hell, religion in itself is an illogical idea, which goes against the "logical" reasoning that we as humans claim to have.

Do elaborate.

Logged  
q<sup>3</sup>

Know thyself.

Note: I am a man

One of the "Crazy Brown-Eyed Three."

Pages: 1 2 3 [4] 5 6 Print

« previous next »

Jump to:

=> Main Hall

Powered by MySQL Powered by PHP Powered by SMF 1.1.18 | SMF © 2013, Simple Machines

Oxygen design by Bloc Valid XHTML 1.0! Valid CSS!

<http://forums.v society.net/index.php/topic%2C3096.60.html>

1 capture

25 Apr 2013  
Mar APR May  
25  
2012 2013 2014

About this capture  
The Veritas Society  
\*

\*HomeForumsChatHelpSearchRetroLoginRegister  
Welcome, Guest. Please login or register.  
Did you miss your activation email?  
April 25, 2013, 08:57:29 AM

Forever

Login with username, password and session length  
Search:

Advanced search

207190 Posts in 14721 Topics by 18395 Members - Latest Member: - Queexgug Most  
online today: 90 - most online ever: 430 (June 28, 2007, 02:58:51 PM)

+ The Veritas Society

|-+ The Auditorium

| |-+ Main Hall

|| |-+ Godlike abilites? 0 Members and 1 Guest are viewing this topic. « previous  
next »

Pages: 1 ... 3 4 [5] 6Print

Author Topic: Godlike abilites? (Read 9751 times)

Neti Neti

he-who-posts-lots

Veritas Furniture

\*\*\*\*

Posts: 363

Karma: 1

he-who-posts-lots

View Profile WWW

Godlike abilites?

« Reply #60 on: November 25, 2004, 06:52:36 PM »

Q is kool. Buddha also showed some "godlike abilities" as well, even if he didn't believe in the God concept. Persay.

There have been other people as well, but none as public or outspoken as our friend Jesus.

Logged

People only see what they are prepared to see.

Give all to love; obey thy heart.

Insist on yourself; never imitate... Every great man is unique.

Nothing can bring you peace but yourself.

Speak what you think today in words as hard as cannon-balls and tomorrow speak what tomorrow thinks in hard words again, though it contradict every thing you said today.[/I]  
Ralph Waldo Emerson

Place Of Heart Board

Alias1

Hundred-plus Club

A Familiar Feature

\*\*\*

Posts: 122

Karma: 1

Hundred-plus Club

[View Profile](#)

Godlike abilites?

« Reply #61 on: November 26, 2004, 01:37:46 AM »

this is a very difficult topic to get a good idea about. "godlike" is a fairly subjective term, though there are many who do not feel it to be or feel that it should not be. if one believes in Christianity or Islam, "godlike" is an oxymoron. in these faiths, God is the infinite, and being like infinity could only mean you stop at a point...making you infinitesimal in comparison (stay with me). so, with these groups, you're either God or you're not. end of story.

as for those of different faiths or no faith...which is still a faith in a way (weird idnit?), there is no standard on what is considered "godlike" so it would be difficult to say how powerful that would be and how realistic that would be. the abilities of people change

over time, so that comparison doesn't help much either. how are these powers actually like those of a "god?" sounds basically like a powerful human. that's subjective as hell. something most humans can't do? how about being rational? is there not power in that? what would you define as power?

my point is a subjective question with lots of subjective factors making for schitzophrenic conversation. i'm just waiting on the word salad. i'm easily entertained as well.

haha.. i can really take the wind out a sail, can't i?

Logged

May you live in interesting times.

"What?" - Arthur Dent

USSJVegta

Greenhorn

New Member

\*

Posts: 5

Karma: 0

Greenhorn

[View Profile](#)

Godlike abilites?

« Reply #62 on: November 26, 2004, 09:25:00 AM »

HAHAH ths thred is funny god is the only god withe god like poers cus then god wouldn't be god he would jus be not god

Logged

Astral slide

Potatoe

A Veritas Regular

\*\*

Posts: 65

Karma: 0

Potatoe

[View Profile](#)

Godlike abilites?

« Reply #63 on: November 26, 2004, 09:27:02 AM »

that sounds just like re teacher ah I think he is really just some mod{Darduck}taking the piss out of halo.

Logged

They view but do not post that tis the thing I ahore

non posters are such a bore

how else will they circlate there lore.

Non popsting primal emountion like a boar.

Please post.

Our I will kick you to the aussie coast.

Tis the thing I HATE MOST.

PLEASE DON'T BE LATE REMEMBER THAT COAST. :fightmonk

ThiefDeath

Posting chief

Posts By Osmosis

\*\*\*\*\*

Posts: 1544

Karma: 4

Grammaton Cleric

[View Profile](#)

Godlike abilites?

« Reply #64 on: November 26, 2004, 12:15:33 PM »

Thanks for elaborating on that ArckAngel.

Logged

[23:48] <DanielH> You guys are all strange

[23:48] <DanielH> You have a different way of thinking (which is wrong)

How about a shave?

AngryLeprachaun

Freelance Leprechaun

Posts By Osmosis

\*\*\*\*\*

Posts: 555

Karma: 0

VERITAS LEP

[View Profile](#)

Godlike abilites?

« Reply #65 on: December 01, 2004, 03:51:19 PM »

I believe god, Jesus Christ himself, is the only person that could have these Godlike abilities that we're talking about. I believe, (not this is my opinion), that people do not have any of the Godlike abilities, but God himself.

Thank you.

Logged

...:Believe:...:

Rafnul!

he-who-posts-lots

Posts By Osmosis

\*\*\*\*\*

Posts: 1063

Karma: 23

[View Profile](#)

Godlike abilites?

« Reply #66 on: December 01, 2004, 07:12:37 PM »

I believe that at least the angels of God, their sons, and a few other people in scripture, among them Moses all have/had such abilities at their disposal.

Logged

Numora

Greenhorn

New Member

\*

Posts: 5

Karma: 0

Greenhorn

[View Profile](#)

Godlike abilites?

« Reply #67 on: December 11, 2004, 06:47:05 PM »

To begin, no human being (besides Jesus) should have God powers. If one of us did, we'd be God incarnate. Second, psi or magick, or whatever you want to call it, can be described as "God imitating" powers. We are created in the likeness of the lord, so he provided us with somewhat an extension of his power. As humans we cannot expect to

have all of his powers regarding the way most people would act with them...

Logged

Cryi

Spittin 'dem pollaseeds

A Familiar Feature

\*\*\*

Posts: 161

Karma: -1

Deeez Nuutz

[View Profile](#)

Godlike abilites?

« Reply #68 on: December 12, 2004, 06:18:52 PM »

What about Jesus:Reloaded? He seems like Jesus to me!

Logged

"He who sits in the heavens shall laugh."

-- Psalm 2:4

"Those who have some means think that the most important thing in the world is love.

The poor know that it is money."

-- Gerald Brenan

Frozen

Posting chief

Veritas Moderator

Posts By Osmosis

\*\*\*\*\*

Posts: 1072

Karma: 0

Posting chief

[View Profile](#)

Godlike abilites?

« Reply #69 on: December 13, 2004, 02:42:26 PM »

Quote from: Winged\_Wolf

Hello, you there up in the stratosphere...come back to the planet. There's a real world here waiting, when you arrive.

It has things like spending 4 years practicing PK so you can occasionally get a ping pong ball to roll across a flat table.  
Live with it.

Whoever this guy is, he's fuckin hilarious.

Logged

\* chirss was kicked by kobok (Denny Crane)

I CARVE EVERYTHING YOU SAY INTO MY LEFT ARM!

~ V

<ShoresofPluto> how often do u ignite fires with ur mind?

<kobok> On occasion.

[20:06] <kobok> XIII: You wear your girlfriend's pants??

[20:06] <XIII> kobok: On occasion.

kakkarot

0. The Fool... Inverted?

Posts By Osmosis

\*\*\*\*\*

Posts: 2701

Karma: 3

Pirate "Not-A-Mod" BoB

[View Profile](#)

Godlike abilites?

« Reply #70 on: December 14, 2004, 06:04:15 AM »

Winged Wolf is a girl and is one of the people who runs the Psion Guild.

~kakkarot

Logged

Philippians 2:5 Your attitude should be the same as that of Christ Jesus: 6 Who, being in very nature God, did not consider equality with God something to be grasped, 7 but made himself nothing, taking the very nature of a servant, being made in human likeness.

Dark Omega Overlord

Regular Member

A Veritas Regular

\*\*

Posts: 64



Karma: -1

Regular Member

[View Profile](#)

Yah!

« Reply #71 on: December 16, 2004, 11:50:43 AM »

Godlike Powers huh..... Yah we can. God created humans we created robots. God will punish us for our sins we torture trorsists.

Anyways.... i got your point. Just read my signature and that is the answer to your quetsions.

And in the bilble sez the we will do greater thing than Jesus....And think about it Jesus did a lot of good shit.....

( im atheist by the way ) lol

Logged

Limits? I have none.....

Training makes everything posible....

Lee Jay

Wind\_Monk

Greenhorn

Settling In

\*

Posts: 20

Karma: 0

Greenhorn

[View Profile](#)

Hmmmm.....

« Reply #72 on: December 16, 2004, 12:08:43 PM »

I agree with Overlord everything is possible with training... Im atheist to BUT CAN YOU

PLEASE TELL US WHERE THE HELL IN THE BIBLE SEZ THAT The Veritas Teethy!  
...sorry and thankx

Logged

Love is the feeling that makes never give up. I love training hard love makes me train harder.

kakkarot

0. The Fool... Inverted?

Posts By Osmosis

\*\*\*\*\*

Posts: 2701

Karma: 3

Pirate "Not-A-Mod" BoB

[View Profile](#)

Godlike abilites?

« Reply #73 on: December 17, 2004, 12:01:09 PM »

"God will punish us for torturing tourists"? Is that what you said?

~kakkarot

Logged

Philippians 2:5 Your attitude should be the same as that of Christ Jesus: 6 Who, being in very nature God, did not consider equality with God something to be grasped, 7 but made himself nothing, taking the very nature of a servant, being made in human likeness.

Faijer

Existential Pragmatist

Veritas Moderator

Posts By Osmosis

\*\*\*\*\*

Posts: 3199

Karma: 41

The Devil's Advocate

[View Profile WWW](#)

Re: Godlike abilites?

« Reply #74 on: April 25, 2006, 11:36:09 AM »

HOLY GRAVEDIGGERS, BATMAN!

Logged

My WordPress Blog is updated regularly.

NEW UPDATE: Life begins at conception: A thought experiment (29/08/2012)

Pages: 1 ... 3 4 [5] 6Print

<http://forums.vociety.net/index.php/topic%2C3096.75.html>

1 capture

30 Apr 2013

Mar APR May

30

2012 2013 2014

About this capture

The Veritas Society

\*

\*HomeForumsChatHelpSearchRetroLoginRegister

Welcome, Guest. Please login or register.

Did you miss your activation email?

April 30, 2013, 09:19:03 AM

Forever

Login with username, password and session length

Search:

Advanced search

207353 Posts in 14733 Topics by 18410 Members - Latest Member: - MindDisciple

Most online today: 98 - most online ever: 430 (June 28, 2007, 02:58:51 PM)

+ The Veritas Society

|-+ The Auditorium

||-+ Main Hall

|||-+ Godlike abilites? 0 Members and 1 Guest are viewing this topic. « previous  
next »

Pages: 1 ... 4 5 [6] Print

Author Topic: Godlike abilites? (Read 9766 times)

Apricot

A Familiar Feature

\*\*\*

Posts: 137

Karma: 0

[View Profile](#)

Re: Godlike abilites?

« Reply #75 on: April 25, 2006, 11:43:48 AM »

Ignoring this topic is dead, I want to say I never understood why people would say a human did something super-human or godlike.

If a person can do it, it's human-like. If it's super human it means it's beyond a person's ability.

There needs to be a different word to describe those things.

PS I can fly, but depending how far it costs a pretty penny and I'm only allowed one carry on

Logged

Would it surprise you to learn I taste like strawberries?

Apricot

A Familiar Feature

\*\*\*

Posts: 137

Karma: 0

[View Profile](#)

Re: Godlike abilites?

« Reply #76 on: April 25, 2006, 12:28:51 PM »

Maybe it would help if I posted a guide

<http://www.orbitz.com/App/PrepareFlightsTab?z=677&r=1p>

Logged

Would it surprise you to learn I taste like strawberries?

Apricot

A Familiar Feature

\*\*\*

Posts: 137

Karma: 0

[View Profile](#)

Re: Godlike abilites?

« Reply #77 on: April 25, 2006, 12:57:03 PM »

My airplane joke must suck... I gotta work on it

Logged

Would it surprise you to learn I taste like strawberries?

Siirenias

Settling In

\*

Posts: 24

Karma: 0

[View Profile WWW](#)

Re: Godlike abilites?

« Reply #78 on: April 25, 2006, 03:36:32 PM »

I got it. I thought it was funny. For that matter, I can easily attain speeds that rival a cheetah, but it costs a pretty penny these days.

On a more serious note, people don't seem to appreciate that being able to contemplate the issue is incredibly unique on this planet.

Logged

psychicT0201

Veritas Furniture

\*\*\*\*

Posts: 339

Karma: 0

[Veritas\\_Hobo - Master of Hobokinesis](#)

[View Profile](#)

Re: Godlike abilites?

« Reply #79 on: April 25, 2006, 06:37:04 PM »

Apricot: I got the joke.

Qrisis: What the hell? How did you NOT get that joke? I'm just curious.

God-like powers eh? What is considered God like powers? In who's perspective?

Does thinking count? \*Thinks\* Smiley

Logged

Australian Warriors

Veritas Furniture

\*\*\*\*

Posts: 420

Karma: 0

[View Profile](#)

Re: Godlike abilites?

« Reply #80 on: April 25, 2006, 07:42:25 PM »

^ now thats a joke i don't understand.

How is thinking godly?

Logged

Lightbringer

Has a lot of posts

Posts By Osmosis

\*\*\*\*\*

Posts: 793

Karma: 0

[Spiritual Warrior](#)

[View Profile](#)

Re: Godlike abilites?

« Reply #81 on: April 25, 2006, 09:28:29 PM »

Quote from: Apricot on April 25, 2006, 11:43:48 AM

Ignoring this topic is dead, I want to say I never understood why people would say a human did something super-human or godlike.

If a person can do it, it's human-like. If it's super human it means it's beyond a person's ability.

Indeed, and eventually, as human achievements become more amazing while God's omnipotence maintains static (as if you could be more omnipotent than omnipotent), the line between humans and God starts to blur. Perhaps the distinction between the two is

simply an arbitrary division? Wink

Logged

The thing that really fascinates me about people is their ability to have no idea what's going on even though it's going on in plain sight all around them and the even more amazing tendency to argue violently when one of these obvious things is presented to them.

Faijer

Existential Pragmatist

Veritas Moderator

Posts By Osmosis

\*\*\*\*\*

Posts: 3199

Karma: 41

The Devil's Advocate

[View Profile WWW](#)

Re: Godlike abilites?

« Reply #82 on: April 26, 2006, 02:59:36 AM »

The point of it being 'super-human' is that it's a comparison to the average human.

Logged

My WordPress Blog is updated regularly.

NEW UPDATE: Life begins at conception: A thought experiment (29/08/2012)

Apricot

A Familiar Feature

\*\*\*

Posts: 137

Karma: 0

[View Profile](#)

Re: Godlike abilites?

« Reply #83 on: April 28, 2006, 08:10:48 AM »

He was replying to me when I said that if a person can do something it's Human like not god like, I mentioned also that if something is super human it means a human can't do it. Above and beyond human, super human

Logged

Would it surprise you to learn I taste like strawberries?

Pages: 1 ... 4 5 [6] Print

« previous next »

Jump to:

=> Main Hall

Powered by MySQL Powered by PHP Powered by SMF 1.1.18 | SMF © 2013, Simple Machines

Oxygen design by Bloc Valid XHTML 1.0! Valid CSS!

<http://forums.vociety.net/index.php?topic=7658.0>

4 captures

7 Jul 2010 - 17 Jul 2014

Sep JUL Aug

17

2011 2014 2015

About this capture

The Veritas Society

\*

\*HomeForumsChatHelpSearchRetroLoginRegister

Welcome, Guest. Please login or register.

Did you miss your activation email?

July 17, 2014, 03:24:54 PM

Forever

Login with username, password and session length

Search:

Advanced search

214965 Posts in 15322 Topics by 19763 Members - Latest Member: - ksyahu Most  
online today: 132 - most online ever: 430 (June 28, 2007, 02:58:51 PM)

+ The Veritas Society

|-+ The Auditorium

| |-+ Main Hall

|| |-+ Death 0 Members and 1 Guest are viewing this topic. « previous next »

Pages: [1] 2 3 Print

Author Topic: Death (Read 4706 times)

zaigon

A Familiar Feature

\*\*\*

Posts: 170

Karma: 0



I have been crushed, nothing left to do but rise

[View Profile](#)

Death

« on: February 11, 2006, 08:00:12 AM »

What are your thoughts about death? As in, do you just die, thats it, game over, end of the line. Do you beleive that when you die you go to heaven, or hell. Do you beleive that we move on to a different plain of existance, or just a different plain all together? Do you beleive that we are reincarnated, or reincarnated untill proven worthy to enter Heaven or another plain of existance. I have been wondering this for a while, and i am not entirly sure, because everyone around me thinks something different. Parents and family- heaven or hell. Some friends- nothing, you just die. Other friends- different plain of existance, once they have been reincarnated a couple times. Some friends- reincarnation forever, and i am still trying to figure out what i beleive, lol.

Logged

V|e|r|i|t|a|s my antidrug

Faijer

Existential Pragmatist

Veritas Moderator

Posts By Osmosis

\*\*\*\*\*

Posts: 3201

Karma: 40

The Devil's Advocate

[View Profile WWW](#)

Re: Death

« Reply #1 on: February 11, 2006, 08:13:37 AM »

Planar existence and reincarnation. I believe that if you die and you have accepted your fate, you will move to a new plane, while if you were not willing to accept it, you will remain in this one and start a new life.

Logged

My WordPress Blog is updated regularly.

NEW UPDATE: Life begins at conception: A thought experiment (29/08/2012)

Australian Warriors

Veritas Furniture

\*\*\*\*

Posts: 420

Karma: 0

[View Profile](#)

Re: Death

« Reply #2 on: February 12, 2006, 12:59:10 AM »

Im a firm believer in reincarnation. Heaven/hell just doesnt sound right to me.....

anywho, i agree, but i'd say the new "plane" is possibly a human race somewhere far far away on the other side of the universe and we travel from and to each time we die.

Logged

Tsumaru

Posts By Osmosis

\*\*\*\*\*

Posts: 1780

Karma: -1

[View Profile](#)

Re: Death

« Reply #3 on: February 12, 2006, 01:04:18 AM »

Uh, AW, so you mean to think that it is another physical planet as such? o.O

Logged

Quote from: Hech on November 19, 2008, 03:59:48 PM

don't believe everything you read... especially if it comes from me.

Australian Warriors

Veritas Furniture

\*\*\*\*

Posts: 420

Karma: 0

[View Profile](#)

Re: Death

« Reply #4 on: February 12, 2006, 01:32:04 AM »

why not?

far far, speaking millions of light years away were a seperate group of humans the same as us are.

Logged

Darkduck

Posts By Osmosis

\*\*\*\*\*

Posts: 1750

Karma: 5

Veritas' Nazgûl

[View Profile WWW](#)

Re: Death

« Reply #5 on: February 12, 2006, 03:57:55 AM »

\*shrugs\*

I firmly believe in reïncarnation; that is unless the person in question has become enlightened. Then, there's no more need to be reïncarnated.

Logged

"Well, aside from sustaining massive internal injuries in a plane crash, and being chased by the army, the navy, and a troop of girl scouts, yeah, I'm, uh, just peachy."

~DD

zaigon

A Familiar Feature

\*\*\*

Posts: 170

Karma: 0

I have been crushed, nothing left to do but rise

[View Profile](#)

Re: Death

« Reply #6 on: February 12, 2006, 08:17:57 AM »

I'm not entirly sure what I beleive in. I was raised a catholic, and was recently confirmed a Catholic. So i was brought up believing in Heaven and Hell. Then i began thinking,

what if there was no heaven and hell? What if you died and just, died? No thoughts, no emotion, no rebirth, nor ascending and whatnot, you just died and became like a rock..... then i began thinking in reincarnation, then i began thinking moving to a different plane of existence or something, now i am not sure.

Logged

V|e|r|i|t|a|s my antidrug

XIII

Pirate of Veritas nth-Dimensional Planes

Veritas Teacher

Posts By Osmosis

\*\*\*\*\*

Posts: 1159

Karma: 9

[View Profile](#)

Re: Death

« Reply #7 on: February 12, 2006, 12:08:54 PM »

I was raised untainted, thankfully, and left to find my own beliefs Smiley

My beliefs are a bit buddhist, mixed with some hermetic ideology. The soul is reincarnated until it is enlightened, and ascends the sephiroth to become one with the all. Though, I'd like it more if muffins were involved....

\*kills DD with a muffin\*

Logged

(04:16:47) (@kobok) And if you push hard enough, you can shove quite a lot into a chicken.

Darkduck

Posts By Osmosis

\*\*\*\*\*

Posts: 1750

Karma: 5

Veritas' Nazgûl

[View Profile WWW](#)

Re: Death

« Reply #8 on: February 12, 2006, 12:28:37 PM »

A muffin:

Me:

...now who do you think would win hmmm?

Logged

"Well, aside from sustaining massive internal injuries in a plane crash, and being chased by the army, the navy, and a troop of girl scouts, yeah, I'm, uh, just peachy."

~DD

XIII

Pirate of Veritas nth-Dimensional Planes

Veritas Teacher

Posts By Osmosis

\*\*\*\*\*

Posts: 1159

Karma: 9

[View Profile](#)

Re: Death

« Reply #9 on: February 12, 2006, 01:36:01 PM »

My beliefs dictate that I must root for the muffin.

Logged

(04:16:47) (@kobok) And if you push hard enough, you can shove quite a lot into a chicken.

DownRodeo

DD-APPROVED! A-OKAYH!!

Veritas Furniture

\*\*\*\*\*

Posts: 498

Karma: 0

[Veritas Furniture](#)

[View Profile WWW](#)

Re: Death

« Reply #10 on: February 12, 2006, 02:20:18 PM »

Quote from: Shadowwarrior13 on February 12, 2006, 01:36:01 PM

My beliefs dictate that I must root for the muffin.

No one can stop the french bakery inquisition! "Zis muffin, is sub parr!!" \*tortures Shadow warrior to death with a lot of bakery implements\*

Oh and err... I believe nothing, I honestly don't know yet, or know that I can ever know...who knows? not me thats for sure!

Logged

"There's a time when the operation of the machine becomes so odious, makes you so sick at heart, that you can't take part, you can't even passively take part, and you've got to put your bodies on the gears and upon the wheels, upon the levers... and you've got to make it stop!"

Mario Savio

Adept

Posting chief

Posts By Osmosis

\*\*\*\*\*

Posts: 1145

Karma: 4

[View Profile](#)

Re: Death

« Reply #11 on: February 12, 2006, 02:30:26 PM »

Yay bakery stuff!

\*kills SW13 with an egg beater\*

Logged

Rafnul!

he-who-posts-lots

Veritas Moderator

Posts By Osmosis

\*\*\*\*\*

Posts: 1081

Karma: 28

[View Profile](#)

Re: Death

« Reply #12 on: February 12, 2006, 04:25:13 PM »

Death... is irrelevant.

Logged

Darkduck

Posts By Osmosis

\*\*\*\*\*

Posts: 1750

Karma: 5

Veritas' Nazgûl

[View Profile WWW](#)

Re: Death

« Reply #13 on: February 13, 2006, 07:29:11 AM »

Quote from: Rafnul on February 12, 2006, 04:25:13 PM

Death... is irrelevant.

You are so emo.

Logged

"Well, aside from sustaining massive internal injuries in a plane crash, and being chased by the army, the navy, and a troop of girl scouts, yeah, I'm, uh, just peachy."

~DD

Rafnul!

he-who-posts-lots

Veritas Moderator

Posts By Osmosis

\*\*\*\*\*

Posts: 1081

Karma: 28

[View Profile](#)

Re: Death

« Reply #14 on: February 20, 2006, 09:32:49 AM »

:((((((

Logged

Pages: [1] 2 3      [Print](#)

« previous next »

Jump to:

=> [Main Hall](#)

Powered by MySQL Powered by PHP    Powered by SMF 1.1.19 | SMF © 2013, Simple Machines

Oxygen design by Bloc    Valid XHTML 1.0! Valid CSS!

[http://vsociety.net/wiki/Evidence\\_of\\_the\\_Metaphysical](http://vsociety.net/wiki/Evidence_of_the_Metaphysical)

17 captures

12 May 2008 - 28 Aug 2016

Jul    AUG    Sep

28

2014   2016   2017

[About this capture](#)

[Evidence of the Metaphysical](#)

[PageDiscussionView sourceHistory](#)

[Thorough Debate on the Existence of Metaphysical Energy](#)

[Tackling the Occult Proof Barrier](#)

[Psionic Proof Compilation Thread](#)

Category: [Significant Forum Topics](#)

[Navigation menu](#)

[Veritas Society](#)

[Main Page](#)

[Forums](#)

[IRC chat](#)

[Recent changes](#)

[Random page](#)

[Help](#)

[Search](#)

[Search](#)

[Tools](#)

[What links here](#)

[Related changes](#)



[Special pages](#)

[Printable version](#)

[Permanent link](#)

[Page information](#)

[Create account](#)[Log in](#)

This page was last modified on 20 July 2007, at 09:19. [Privacy policy](#) [About Veritas](#)

[Disclaimers](#)

Powered by [MediaWiki](#)

<http://forums.v society.net/index.php?topic=8667.0>

6 captures

07 Jul 2010 - 18 Jul 2014

Jun JUL Aug

18

2013 2014 2015

[About this capture](#)

The Veritas Society

\*

[\\*Home](#)[Forums](#)[Chat](#)[Help](#)[Search](#)[Retro](#)[Login](#)[Register](#)

Welcome, Guest. Please login or register.

[Did you miss your activation email?](#)

July 18, 2014, 02:18:40 AM

Forever

Login with username, password and session length

Search:

[Advanced search](#)

214972 Posts in 15322 Topics by 19763 Members - Latest Member: - ksyahu Most  
online today: 115 - most online ever: 430 (June 28, 2007, 02:58:51 PM)

+ The Veritas Society

| -+ The Auditorium

| | -+ Main Hall

| | | -+ New level of skepticism 0 Members and 1 Guest are viewing this topic. «

previous next »

Pages: [1] 2 3 ... 9 [Print](#)

Author Topic: New level of skepticism (Read 17739 times)

Enchia

Posts By Osmosis

\*\*\*\*\*

Posts: 977

Karma: 27

View Profile

New level of skepticm

« on: July 09, 2006, 11:07:31 AM »

There is a heatend debate going on in The Psionics Commite

[http://z13.invisionfree.com/The\\_Psionics\\_Commite/index.php?showtopic=41&st=0](http://z13.invisionfree.com/The_Psionics_Commite/index.php?showtopic=41&st=0)

Check it out

Logged

solstice

Dreamwalker

Posts By Osmosis

\*\*\*\*\*

Posts: 2114

Karma: -4

"Receive and transmit..."

View Profile

Re: New level of skepticm

« Reply #1 on: July 09, 2006, 11:19:02 AM »

Those people dont even know how to spell the name of their organization; the person posting does not seem to undertsand what metaphysical means, either.

Logged

Tell all the Truth but tell it slant: Success in Circuit lies. Too bright for our infirm  
Delight. The Truth's superb surprise. As Lightning to the Children eased, with  
explanation kind. The Truth must dazzle gradually, or every man be blind.

Tefeari: The Giant Impact Hypothesis is a theory

Enchia

Posts By Osmosis

\*\*\*\*\*

Posts: 977

Karma: 27

[View Profile](#)

Re: New level of skepticm

« Reply #2 on: July 09, 2006, 11:26:19 AM »

Machinechimera you mean. Yes I know if I only could kick him in the b\*lls

Logged

Mobius

Veritas Council

Veritas Furniture

\*\*\*\*\*

Posts: 329

Karma: 25

Fundamental Psi Coordinator

[View Profile](#)

Re: New level of skepticm

« Reply #3 on: July 09, 2006, 11:34:40 AM »

Quote from: Enchia on July 09, 2006, 11:26:19 AM

Machinechimera you mean. Yes I know if I only could kick him in the b\*lls

Now that just isn't nice. Some of his points are quite valid, and things the OEC in general would do well to consider. Some of his assertions are just flat out wrong, though.

I will contemplate addressing him. He is welcome to post here in the main hall, as well.

« Last Edit: July 09, 2006, 11:37:06 AM by `Gemini »   Logged

Deus Ex Vir

Silverdawn

Posts By Osmosis

\*\*\*\*\*

Posts: 620

Karma: 2

[View Profile WWW](#)

Re: New level of skepticm

« Reply #4 on: July 09, 2006, 12:14:29 PM »

It should be pointed out Machinechimera is quite right in one respect. Metaphysics is not mysticism. The etymology of the word is found in historical context: the philosopher Aristotle wrote a number of works which together were called 'Physics'. These books were placed in the Library of Alexandria. Some time later, he wrote additional texts that concerned a basic, fundamental area of philosophical inquiry. Then, early Aristotelian scholars called those books 'ta meta ta physika biblia' which means "the books that come after the (books about) physics." The Metaphysics of Aristotle are indeed a collection of philosophical texts, and that's still the meaning of the word.

However, he is wrong about something else. Metaphysics is a branch of philosophy concerned with explaining the world, not a soft science for which you can demand proof. I am interested to see where the rest of the discussion goes: hopefully he does not make any more false assumptions.

-Silver  
Logged  
Enchia  
Posts By Osmosis  
\*\*\*\*\*  
Posts: 977  
Karma: 27

[View Profile](#)

Re: New level of skepticm  
« Reply #5 on: July 09, 2006, 01:25:01 PM »  
It won't go much further, he has a statement and don't want to hear anything of what is said.  
Continuing won't have any effect and will not bring up new things.  
« Last Edit: July 09, 2006, 01:38:20 PM by Enchia »    Logged  
Zake  
Veritas Staff  
Veritas Moderator  
Posts By Osmosis  
\*\*\*\*\*  
Posts: 1722  
Karma: 1

Veritas Staff

[View Profile](#)

Re: New level of skepticism

« Reply #6 on: July 09, 2006, 05:48:02 PM »

By and large, yah, the word "metaphysics" refers to a branch of philosophy. However, here in Veritas, a general decision was made (by a poll) to refer to the topics of the OEC (psionics, magic, chi arts, etc) as "metaphysics" simply as a useful and descriptive word. So no one can be blamed for erroneously "correcting" the mistake, particularly outside of Veritas itself. (They can be blamed for getting the actual definition wrong, though that would be a separate issue.)

And, well, that debate is indeed heated, however, that is a far cry from actually being a worthwhile debate. Seriously, its just a skeptic lecturing some psions and the psions yelling back.

Logged

Act; for the universe will never forget your movement, nor will it ever forgive your stillness.

Vecna

Heartless Admin

Tech Team

Posts By Osmosis

\*\*\*\*\*

Posts: 983

Karma: 11

The Silence Between the Void

[View Profile](#)

Re: New level of skepticism

« Reply #7 on: July 09, 2006, 11:47:32 PM »

Quote from: Zake on July 09, 2006, 05:48:02 PM

By and large, yah, the word "metaphysics" refers to a branch of philosophy. However, here in Veritas, a general decision was made (by a poll) to refer to the topics of the OEC (psionics, magic, chi arts, etc) as "metaphysics" simply as a useful and descriptive word. So no one can be blamed for erroneously "correcting" the mistake, particularly outside of Veritas itself. (They can be blamed for getting the actual definition wrong, though that would be a separate issue.)

And, well, that debate is indeed heated, however, that is a far cry from actually being a worthwhile debate. Seriously, its just a skeptic lecturing some psions and the psions yelling back.

That doesn't mean we all use that word though, Zake, in the same way. Wink

~Crowley  
Logged

kobok  
Veritas Council  
Tech Team  
Posts By Osmosis  
\*\*\*\*\*

Posts: 4891  
Karma: 158

Veritas Council

[View Profile](#)

Re: New level of skepticm  
« Reply #8 on: July 10, 2006, 03:39:14 AM »  
I'm seeing:

<1> It's all crap, and no reputable scientists believe it!  
<2> Would we believe it if it weren't true?  
<1> Aren't you listening? I said no scientists believe it, even though I didn't actually bother to look anything up about it!  
<2> But you should just try it, then you would know!  
\* wash, rinse, repeat \*

And while MachineChimera said two days ago that he would join here and start a thread on skepticism, it would appear that he has not arrived. (Maybe he read one of our many existing threads on the topic and then left.)

Logged  
Latest article: [Construct Dynamics](#)

Want to learn psi? [Check out our collection of psi articles.](#)

Enchia  
Posts By Osmosis  
\*\*\*\*\*

Posts: 977  
Karma: 27

[View Profile](#)

Re: New level of skepticm

« Reply #9 on: July 10, 2006, 03:49:35 AM »

Quote from: kobok on July 10, 2006, 03:39:14 AM

I'm seeing:

<1> It's all crap, and no reputable scientists believe it!

<2> Would we believe it if it weren't true?

<1> Aren't you listening? I said no scientists believe it, even though I didn't actually bother to look anything up about it!

<2> But you should just try it, then you would know!

\* wash, rinse, repeat \*

That circel will go on and on and on that why I don't respond anymore. I just wait until somebody else will come up with an other statment then that.

Logged

kobok

Veritas Council

Tech Team

Posts By Osmosis

\*\*\*\*\*

Posts: 4891

Karma: 158

Veritas Council

[View Profile](#)

Re: New level of skepticm

« Reply #10 on: July 10, 2006, 03:52:11 AM »

Quote from: Enchia on July 10, 2006, 03:49:35 AM

That circel will go on and on and on that why I don't respond anymore. I just wait until somebody else will come up with an other statment then that.

Well, I would if he were here. Smiley But I'm not in the mood tonight to drive across town to watch a train wreck...

Logged

Latest article: Construct Dynamics

Want to learn psi? Check out our collection of psi articles.

MachineChimera

Settling In

\*

Posts: 37

Karma: 0

[View Profile](#)

Re: New level of skepticm

« Reply #11 on: July 10, 2006, 05:54:51 AM »

\*Perks\* Did somebody say -Trainwreck?!- Color me interested.

First off, let me start with a greeting to all present, since I'm the new guy. That having been said, I'll attempt to respond to each comment or response in the order they have and do come.

Quote

However, he is wrong about something else. Metaphysics is a branch of philosophy concerned with explaining the world, not a soft science for which you can demand proof. I am interested to see where the rest of the discussion goes: hopefully he does not make any more false assumptions.

-Silver

Metaphysics, like all branches of Philosophy, is entirely a soft science. Consider the definition "Soft science is a colloquial term, often used pejoratively, for academic research or scholarship which is purportedly "scientific" while its adherence to or rigor of scientific method is considered to be soft, not based on reproducible experimental data and/or a mathematical explanation of that data."

By nature, you cannot "demand proof" for any soft science, since they are by and large matters for which data is considered qualitative, instead've quantitatively. The "proof" I have demanded is qualitative proof.. evidence in demonstration and application of use. I have not demanded that someone should point out the energy behind the supposed forces in question, or their laws of operation, or so on, so much as demanded that someone make reliable, demonstrative use of it before entities capable of reliably qualifying it as valid.

Quote

I'm seeing:

<1> It's all crap, and no reputable scientists believe it!

<2> Would we believe it if it weren't true?

<1> Aren't you listening? I said no scientists believe it, even though I didn't actually



bother to look anything up about it!

<2> But you should just try it, then you would know!

\* wash, rinse, repeat \* - Kobok

Mostly correct in so much as the overall tone of the disagreement, save that you have erred on the point of assumptive ignorance, in the same fashion as Darknen did. I've studied occultism in myriad forms from likely the same sources most of you have, I should think, which traditionally comes in written format. Also, my point is not 'no reputable scientist believe it', so much as the reason why no reputable scientist believes in such; a lack of logical reason to do so. I could as easily start up a study of invisible octopi and theorize that they are in fact responsible for 80% of traffic accidents, and it would be as impossible to prove the erroneousness of such a belief system as to do likewise considering the various occult "arts." As such, when one holds a belief in something that can be as reliably 'proven' by anecdotal, unreliable accounts as something a person makes up directly on the spot, one should probably consider the probability that one's belief is equally as erroneous as well. That's my primary point; believing in something without a rational reason to do so, is irrational, and one does not discover the 'truth' about anything irrationally, since truth itself is by definition, a rational thing. You cannot come to know the Rational by irrational means.

I also found it -hilarious- that a majority of the posters that have commented thusfar actually didn't know the real meaning of 'metaphysics/metaphysical', and sought to derisively criticize my definition of it, before someone that actually -is- familiar with the actual meaning of the word being so liberally bandied about, posted it. Ha. Ha. Please reserve all kicks to the balls, kthnx.

Cheesy

Edit: Added quote boxes for easier reading ~Crowley

« Last Edit: July 11, 2006, 05:43:54 AM by Crowley » Logged

Darkflame

Frequent poster

Posts By Osmosis

\*\*\*\*\*

Posts: 556

Karma: 1

武礼久

[View Profile](#)

Re: New level of skepticm

« Reply #12 on: July 10, 2006, 07:42:25 AM »

Quote from: MachineChimera on July 10, 2006, 05:54:51 AM

I could as easily start up a study of invisible octopi and theorize that they are in fact responsible for 80% of traffic accidents, and it would be as impossible to prove the erroneousness of such a belief system as to do likewise considering the various occult "arts."

Appeal to ridicule.

The meanings and connotations of words change. I am aware of what Aristotle used the word to mean, but I still recognise that today in this community it is mainly used as an umbrella term and so I use it suitable to the context.

But I would like to ask what is it that makes such scientists that perform paranormal studies unreputable? Is it because they study it, or have they all done something to become unreputable? And does reputation really have an impact on a good scientific finding?

Logged

<kobok> Link isn't wearing any pants.

<kobok> What sort of goblin porn is this?

<Prophecy> Darkflame: A swift punch to one of the eyes has marvellous results.

Silverdawn

Posts By Osmosis

\*\*\*\*\*

Posts: 620

Karma: 2

[View Profile WWW](#)

Re: New level of skepticm

« Reply #13 on: July 10, 2006, 07:48:58 AM »

I will reply only to the comment addressed to me:

Quote from: MachineChimera on July 10, 2006, 05:54:51 AM

Metaphysics, like all branches of Philosophy, is entirely a soft science. Consider the definition "Soft science is a colloquial term, often used pejoratively, for academic research or scholarship which is purportedly "scientific" while its adherence to or rigor of scientific method is considered to be soft, not based on reproducible experimental data and/or a mathematical explanation of that data."

This text is copied word-for-word from its definition in the Wikipedia, which also states the following:

Quote from: Wikipedia

But in general, history, literature, anthropology, mathematic or law are not regarded as science as their methodology is regarded distinct enough to be separate from science and their field of study existed well before the emergence of science.

An argument could be made for philosophy as well, and this argument is indeed made later on in the article. The article in question also states there is an ongoing discussion on its definition. So I would dispute that all branches of philosophy (no capital letter) are a soft science. Note that the Wikipedia article on philosophy does not contain the phrase 'soft science' - in fact, it mentions that the definition of philosophy as any form of science is disputable. Feel free to look up this entry. I also fail to see how the evidence in demonstration and application of use applies to, as you say, all branches of philosophy. That is quite a statement - have you studied philosophy?

If I disregard your comment that philosophy is a soft science - which I repeat it is not - and focus on metaphysics exclusively, I will give you this quote from the same source you just used:

Quote from: Wikipedia

There is no valid set of empirical observations nor a valid set of logical arguments, which could definitively prove metaphysical statements to be true or false. Hence, a metaphysical statement usually implies a belief about the world or about the universe, which may seem reasonable but is ultimately not empirically verifiable.

Now that we've argued definitions, however, I'm more interested in kobok's contribution to this thread. Oh, and welcome.

Logged  
MachineChimera  
Settling In  
\*

Posts: 37  
Karma: 0

[View Profile](#)

Re: New level of skepticm

« Reply #14 on: July 10, 2006, 08:22:00 AM »

Quote

"Appeal to ridicule." -Darkflame

Very good; you've demonstrated your ability to ... point out prevalent techniques used in classical debate. I'm not sure what that lends to the discussion at hand, but I'm sure everyone is impressed by the perspicacity you've demonstrated.

Quote

"The meanings and connotations of words change. I am aware of what Aristotle used the word to mean, but I still recognise that today in this community it is mainly used as an umbrella term and so I use it suitable to the context.

But I would like to ask what is it that makes such scientists that perform paranormal studies unreputable? Is it because they study it, or have they all done something to become unreputable? And does reputation really have an impact on a good scientific finding?" -DarkFlame

The meanings and connotations of a word change via societal development and influences. That is accepted. A word's meaning and connotation do not change in society as a result of a specific community deeming it to be so solely, and in so abrupt a fashion as a poll taken by an infinitesimally small portion of a percent of society itself. You may, in this community, use any term you desire freely, to mean anything.. you may call cars Tacos, or people Carrots, but you do not change the correct meaning/definition of the actual word Taco or Carrot, respectively. Likewise, if you go bandying your communal use of the word Taco or Carrot for example, in those contexts, to people outside your small "community", you stand to be corrected, unless you qualify your use as communal only, and not the actual definition of the word in it's proper use.

I'm not aware I stated scientists performing paranormal studies were unreputable. What I did state was that no evidence is ever forthcoming in the company of reputable witnesses. As to whether reputation has any impact on scientific findings.. ah, yes. If an uneducated hobo from under the local main street's bridge purports to have discovered that Pi is in fact finite, he's going to be laughed at/ignored. Let a renown mathematician make the same claim, and I can guarantee he'll get coverage and inquiry. While reputability/credibility has no direct impact on a true scientific finding or revelation of "fact" itself, it has entirely a world of impact upon the degree of skepticism it will be met with, and how seriously such a claim may be taken.

Quote

"An argument could be made for philosophy as well, and this argument is indeed made later on in the article. The article in question also states there is an ongoing discussion on its definition. So I would dispute that all branches of philosophy (no capital letter) are a soft science. Note that the Wikipedia article on philosophy does not contain the phrase 'soft science' - in fact, it mentions that the definition of philosophy as any form of science is disputable. Feel free to look up this entry. I also fail to see how the evidence in demonstration and application of use applies to, as you say, all branches of philosophy. That is quite a statement - have you studied philosophy?

If I disregard your comment that philosophy is a soft science - which I repeat it is not - and focus on metaphysics exclusively, I will give you this quote from the same source you just used:

Quote from: Wikipedia

Now that we've argued definitions, however, I'm more interested in kobok's contribution to this thread. Oh, and welcome." -SilverDawn

There are always on-going discussions for the purposes of refinement for any number of issues within a 'soft science', and the wordings included in definition is no different. Compare the word choices for definitions in a dictionary a few decades ago, to the definitions included at present texts, if you desire. Similarly, the definition provided under soft science fits quite nicely in description of Philosophy as a body; "adherence to or rigor of the scientific method, not based upon reproducible experimental data and/or a mathematical explanation of that data." If you dispute that Philosophy fits that bill, then you dispute one of the following: that it adheres to the scientific method, or that it is based upon reproducible experimental data and/or mathematical explanation of that data." I'm fairly certain you do not assert this to be the case, so I must assume the former.

That being the case, perhaps you do not understand either the definition of philosophy, or of the Scientific method. The former is defined as "the love and pursuit of wisdom through INTELLECTUAL MEANS and moral self-discipline." "Investigation of the nature, causes, or principles of reality, knowledge, or values, based upon LOGICAL REASONING rather than empirical methods." "The disciplines presented in university curriculums of SCIENCE and the liberal arts, except medicine, law, and theology." The prevalent theme in the primary definitions of Philosophy include the pursuit of knowledge through Intellectual means, based upon logical reasoning. The Scientific Method is broken down into four component parts, the foremost of which is observation and description of a phenomenon or group of phenomena. Does the study of philosophy, and philosophy itself, utilize this means? Check. The second, Formulation of a hypothesis to explain the phenomenon. Does philosophy do this? Yes. Use of a hypothesis to predict the existence of other phenomena, or to predict QUANTITATIVELY the results of new observations. Again, Philosophy = Check. All that's lacking in philosophy in its otherwise fairly strict adherence to the scientific method is the fourth/final step; experimental tests of the prediction by several independent experimenters and properly performed experiment. Obviously, the fourth step cannot be applied to something that cannot be tested by empirical means, as the definition for a soft science already includes.

So... how exactly, by the very definitions of both the Scientific Method, and of Philosophy, do you arrive at the assertion that Philosophy does not adhere to the usage of the Scientific Method? Indeed, Philosophy is even taught in most colleges as a Science, for that very same reason: it is a body of intellectual pursuit based solely upon observations made through the usage of logic and reasoning. Perhaps you simply do not like that specific definition provided via Wikipedia, for "soft science." Feel free to find another source of definition for "soft science" from another source, if you think philosophy only falls under the definition of same because of the wording in Wikipedia. You'll find, I'm certain, that every definition you find for the term, will be inclusive of philosophy.

As to your quote from same article, regarding metaphysics.. What's your point? The very thing I'm stating, even in the thread from the other site this thread links in opening topic, is that such claims are more akin to a Faith/religious statement, being incapable of proof or disproof, much akin to any other ridiculous statement that could be contrived, such as the invisible octopi being responsible for traffic accidents.

Thank you for the welcome. ;d

Modified to add the following: Yes, I have studied philosophy, as well as ethics and epistymology. The name that I'm using now derives from reference to hard determinalism, and to the nature of man.

Edit: Added quote boxes for ease of reading ~Crowley  
« Last Edit: July 11, 2006, 05:44:57 AM by Crowley » Logged  
Pages: [1] 2 3 ... 9 Print  
« previous next »  
Jump to:  
=> Main Hall

Powered by MySQL Powered by PHP Powered by SMF 1.1.19 | SMF © 2013, Simple Machines

Oxygen design by Bloc Valid XHTML 1.0! Valid CSS!  
<http://forums.v society.net/index.php/topic%2C8667.15.html>  
2 captures

07 Jul 2010 - 29 Apr 2013

Mar APR May

29

2012 2013 2014

About this capture

The Veritas Society

\*

\*HomeForumsChatHelpSearchRetroLoginRegister

Welcome, Guest. Please login or register.

Did you miss your activation email?

April 29, 2013, 12:59:46 PM

Forever

Login with username, password and session length

Search:

[Advanced search](#)

207328 Posts in 14731 Topics by 18409 Members - Latest Member: - nest4sudan

Most online today: 99 - most online ever: 430 (June 28, 2007, 02:58:51 PM)

+ [The Veritas Society](#)

| -+ [The Auditorium](#)

| | -+ [Main Hall](#)

| | | -+ [New level of skepticism](#)      0 Members and 1 Guest are viewing this topic. «  
[previous](#) [next](#) »

Pages: 1 [2] 3 4 ... 9 [Print](#)

Author      Topic: [New level of skepticism](#)    (Read 15054 times)

[solstice](#)

[Dreamwalker](#)

[Posts By Osmosis](#)

\*\*\*\*\*

Posts: 2114

Karma: -6

"Receive and transmit..."

[View Profile](#)

Re: [New level of skepticism](#)

« [Reply #15 on: July 10, 2006, 08:29:16 AM](#) »

Hey, Kobot, aint you a reputable scientist? <G>

Logged

Tell all the Truth but tell it slant: Success in Circuit lies.    Too bright for our infirm  
Delight. The Truth's superb surprise. As Lightning to the Children eased, with  
explanation kind.    The Truth must dazzle gradually, or every man be blind.

Tefeari: The Giant Impact Hypothesis is a theory

[SethLaRoth DeShawl](#)

[Regular Member](#)

[Posts By Osmosis](#)

\*\*\*\*\*

Posts: 581

Karma: 10

[View Profile](#)

Re: New level of skepticm

« Reply #16 on: July 10, 2006, 09:28:26 AM »

I have never seen him make the claim but if so, more power to the community.

\*rereads post by MachineChimera\*

\*eyes bulge and head explodes\*

Logged

MachineChimera

Settling In

\*

Posts: 37

Karma: 0

[View Profile](#)

Re: New level of skepticm

« Reply #17 on: July 10, 2006, 09:31:40 AM »

Quote

I have never seen him make the claim but if so, more power to the community.

\*rereads post by MachineChimera\*

\*eyes bulge and head explodes\*

\*Buffs nails and smirks.\* Yeah. I have that effect. Cheesy

Edit: Added quote boxes for easier reading ~Crowley

« Last Edit: July 11, 2006, 05:45:46 AM by Crowley » Logged

Faijer

Existential Pragmatist

Veritas Moderator

Posts By Osmosis

\*\*\*\*\*

Posts: 3199

Karma: 41

[The Devil's Advocate](#)

[View Profile WWW](#)



Re: New level of skepticm

« Reply #18 on: July 10, 2006, 01:18:54 PM »

Thread cleared, I'm taking it to PM to avoid clutter.

Logged

My WordPress Blog is updated regularly.

NEW UPDATE: Life begins at conception: A thought experiment (29/08/2012)

MachineChimera

Settling In

\*

Posts: 37

Karma: 0

[View Profile](#)

Re: New level of skepticm

« Reply #19 on: July 10, 2006, 01:23:18 PM »

Ahhh. I see. Moderator jumps the gun and insults out of nowhere, the new guy.

New guy defends himself. Moderator magically sweeps the evidence under the rug when it goes badly for him, and feigns to take the high road by labeling it an attempt to avoid clutter. Didn't know that's how things work hereabouts. ;o

Logged

Faijer

Existential Pragmatist

Veritas Moderator

Posts By Osmosis

\*\*\*\*\*

Posts: 3199

Karma: 41

[The Devil's Advocate](#)

[View Profile WWW](#)

Re: New level of skepticm

« Reply #20 on: July 10, 2006, 01:28:21 PM »

Now that's a personal attack, I could put it back if I wanted to, but you yourself requested that we stay on topic. At any rate the people who could make any decisions about my position as a moderator will be able to see the posts, as they remain in a place that staff can view. So no evidence has been magically deleted, simply moved to

a place that people who don't need to read it, i.e., the general memberbase, can't. If you have any questions over the veracity of the 'Recycling Bin', the happy place where deleted posts go, you can ask any other member of the staff for a screenshot if you'd like.

Logged

My WordPress Blog is updated regularly.

NEW UPDATE: Life begins at conception: A thought experiment (29/08/2012)

MachineChimera

Settling In

\*

Posts: 37

Karma: 0

[View Profile](#)

Re: New level of skepticism

« Reply #21 on: July 10, 2006, 01:36:03 PM »

\*nod\* Very well.

Logged

Forg

The V' Smithy

Posts By Osmosis

\*\*\*\*\*

Posts: 827

Karma: 20

[View Profile](#)

Re: New level of skepticism

« Reply #22 on: July 10, 2006, 01:51:14 PM »

I do suppose we must get a few scientists so they can say what those here that are 'capable', are infact capable. Because, gosh darn it, what I've done and seen done seems an awful lot like proof to me. I'll make sure to take a few snapshots though next time for ya Smiley

Also to be noted: Where in the things that require belief such as the topic at hand, an experience of certain proofs on the level of that persons acceptance are necessary. No for you to say that something does or does not work you would need a level of evidence. I see claims...but my question to you is, have you tried any of it?

As far as the many concerned fields such as magick or psionics, there is a lot less to be

found in terms of readily accessible proof, and much more to be found in simple denial and rejection. Kinda like the concept of the earth being the center of the solar system/. Before people were able to take a better look, it was crazy and stupid to think such things. But when they could finally see, there wasn't any more too it (give or take a few crazed maniacs in places of power).

Now where I can not directly present you a venue to see that is quick or easy, there still are ways. I suggest playing both sides of the field before you jump to these conclusions, if infact you are.

« Last Edit: July 10, 2006, 01:58:02 PM by Forg »      Logged

Be your own light, your own refuge. Believe only that which you test for yourself. Do not accept authority merely because it comes from a great man, or is written in a sacred book, for truth is different for each man and woman." -- Buddha

Slinger

Settling In

\*

Posts: 12

Karma: 0

[View Profile](#)

Re: New level of skepticm

« Reply #23 on: July 10, 2006, 02:58:39 PM »

1) Cool, that's my forum.

2) Hmm....didn't we already fix the name and banner? Apparently the link doesn't matter to much.

3) Wow..that debate with Machine might be contagiouse. If got restarted here...did it?

This debate may never end. Heh. Besides it's all so a good example opf all sorts of these psions vs. skepticism devates. Someone needs clear proof. Both sides, that is. This will be...for a while.

Logged

Vox Nocti

Frequent poster

Veritas Furniture

\*\*\*\*

Posts: 256

Karma: 0

Frequent poster

[View Profile](#)

Re: New level of skepticm

« Reply #24 on: July 10, 2006, 03:33:36 PM »

If you want to take it up with me, take it to PM, don't post it in here for the same reasons I previously cleaned out the topic, because I will only feel compelled to do it again for the previously stated reasons.

- Faijer

\*edits the edit\*

ZOMG DONE!

~Vox

« Last Edit: July 10, 2006, 03:56:54 PM by Vox Nocti »      Logged

"I'd like to apologize in advance for anything that I may say or do that could be construed as offensive as I slowly go NUTS." (Col. Jack 'O Neill, Stargate sg-1)

Ashrak: "And you are considered...well, a pain in the nikta"

'O Neill: "Neck?"

Teal'c: "No."

MachineChimera

Settling In

\*

Posts: 37

Karma: 0

[View Profile](#)

Re: New level of skepticm

« Reply #25 on: July 10, 2006, 05:19:02 PM »

Quote

"I do suppose we must get a few scientists so they can say what those here that are 'capable', are infact capable. Because, gosh darn it, what I've done and seen done seems an awful lot like proof to me. I'll make sure to take a few snapshots though next time for ya

Also to be noted: Where in the things that require belief such as the topic at hand, an experience of certain proofs on the level of that persons acceptance are necessary. No for you to say that something does or does not work you would need a level of evidence. I see claims...but my question to you is, have you tried any of it?

As far as the many concerned fields such as magick or psionics, there is a lot less to be found in terms of readily accessible proof, and much more to be found in simple denial and rejection. Kinda like the concept of the earth being the center of the solar system/. Before people were able to take a better look, it was crazy and stupid to think such things. But when they could finally see, there wasn't any more too it (give or take a few crazed maniacs in places of power).

Now where I can not directly present you a venue to see that is quick or easy, there still are ways. I suggest playing both sides of the field before you jump to these conclusions, if in fact you are. " -Forg

Of course it seems like proof to you; you're mentally predisposed to believe in it. Or are we to accept that everything someone THINKS They experience, see, or hear, actually IS what was there/what happened? So I suppose when people trip acid or do other drugs, and see the walls melting, or smurfs running around, it's actually true? OMG THERE ARE SMURFS AND MELTING WALLS?!?! Ah, no. So, it's common knowledge that, under the right conditions, a person's brain can tell them all manner of things that aren't actually true. -Especially- when someone really, really wants to believe something badly enough. Further argument for personal experiences? Just about EVERY Single religion that's ever existed has had people purporting to have personal experiences with gods, angels, devils, nature spirits, their ancestor spirits, animal/totem spirits.. you name it. So.. Then EVERY religion that's ever existed has been true, right? Quite a busy cosmological paradigm you must have, if that's the case. And if not, then it's awfully selective of you to decide which personal experiences of supposed paranormal activity were real and valid, and which aren't. YOU know what, I'm seeing a pattern here. Anecdotal accounts are the only 'evidence' of the phenomena, which defies all witnessing by credible skeptics, and evades all the best scientific minds and equipment. Hm. Alien abductions.. Loch Ness Monster, ghost hauntings, possession/demonic attack, magic(K)al powers, psychic abilities.. how strange. Also, I see another pattern! \*gasp\* Almost ALL of them miraculously fail to be witnesses or experienced by people with formal education and a 'healthy' upbringing. Why is it that none of this seems to be the case with people having degrees, for the most part? How strange!!

Have I tried any of it? Hm. Have you tried leaping off a building and flying like superman, Forg? Have you tried not eating food or drink for a year, to see if the need for nutrition is just a government propaganda? Have you tried to see if you could burn yourself, and absorb the power of fire by dowsing yourself in gasoline and then striking a match? What about stopping a speeding bus with your bare hands? .. No? W..what? I'm stunned. Wait. Why not? How do you know you can't do this stuff, if you don't try? You could REALLY be missing out! You could be flying around in the air, saving oodles of cash not wasted on life-sustaining food and beverage, shooting fire everywhere and flexing your super bus-stopping strength!! Oh. Yeah.. you know you can't do these things. Which is why you haven't. Hm. But I'm puzzled. You -KNOW- you can't do these things, but you haven't actually tried it?

If someone pulls a gun on you and starts shooting, would you try to avoid being shot? But why? You don't KNOW until you try, if the bullets will just bounce off your chest? Hm. Again, I see that people argue "We have no proof, but you can't say it's not possible until you've tried it!".. and these are the very same people that function every day in every decision they make, making logical decisions based upon rational considerations of the subjects involved, and the rational assumption that what is true in one instance is true in every instance with the same variables. Hm. How exactly do you reconcile this strange duality of Logic and Illogic? "I'm rational in my everyday life, but for things I really like, I'm irrational." Children do that, you know. It's called "Playing Pretend." A child knows how things work, but enjoy pretending that things aren't as they actually know they are. Yet another similar pattern of behavior. ;o

Lots less to be found in terms of readily accessible proof, than in denial and rejection? Uh... what? Have you -read- some of the malarchy bandied about on these topics? People claim to CHANGE THE TEMPERATURE in the room, move things with their minds, create psychic balls of floating, colorful energy, or to be able to read peoples' thoughts, or know things about people that they couldn't know otherwise. ALL of these things are EASILY, readily provable, if they are capable of being done. You go into a lab, say "you're wrong, scientists. Watch this" And then you demonstrate. Eh.. what's the hold up? Oooooooooohh.. right. That -reality- factor, where none of this actually exists. I keep forgetting about that. ;p

Ah.. also, I wouldn't go comparing the fallacy of 'occult' powers being real, to the ignorance of the earth being the center of the solar system. You're comparing a time when we are technologically advanced enough to see the furthest reaches of the galaxy, mathematically calculate how fast the universe is expanding, the temperatures of far off dwindling Stars based solely upon complicated physics and color patterns, and the ability to create mechanical semblances of LIFE.. to.. a time when people weren't even formally educated as a vast majority, and believed that dragons flew about, or that god was responsible for weather patterns. Well, I'd like to think we're far from that, but evidently some people still think supernatural powers are responsible for lightning or hail storms, and that dragons are still flying around. Doh. The difference between the two being that, when someone stepped forward and said "HEY, the earth is NOT the center of the solar system", he had the means to PROVE it. That's the nature of an assertion: if you're going to make a statement about the nature of reality, you'd better be able to verify it. I dare say, it was a harder time of proving the structure of the solar system and the earth's position in it, than for someone that can supposedly move things with their mind, or change ambient degrees, to do that around reputable witnesses. Also, the technology at the time was not sufficient predating that discovery, to actually learn the earth's place. The technology IS present to learn whether occult phenomena is real, and has been for some time: walk up to somebody that doesn't believe, and then prove it. Throw some lightning around? Oh wait, magic doesn't work ("that way." I think It was more correct as I worded it without parenthesis.). Why not levitate their shoes? Life some sheets of paper. Make it colder in the room. Produce some fire in your palm. No to any of those? Well. Pretty worthless 'powers', if you ask me, since they only seem to work when nobody's watching.

Rather, I'm not "Jumping to conclusions" about the non-existence of all these supposed powers, but making the rational, informed decision most other adults have: magic and psionics isn't real. It's a left-over, a relic from more ignorant times where people needed to believe in something more than the world around them, something more exciting or personally validating. Something comforting. "I'm special. I can do stuff other people can't." "I'm special, I'm not brainwashed by the conformist beliefs of society." "I know things will be okay, because God is watching over me, so everything happens for a reason." Stuff like that. Mental illusions that let people get by, that help them to cope.

See, if any of this crap could happen, SOMEONE that could do it, would prove it. Probably does more. The fact that, once again.. NOBODY in the history of its claim has ever stepped before a body of people not predisposed to its belief and PROVEN such forces exist, is proof positive.

Edit: Added quote boxes for ease of reading ~Crowley  
« Last Edit: July 11, 2006, 05:46:55 AM by Crowley » Logged

Zake

Veritas Staff

Veritas Moderator

Posts By Osmosis

\*\*\*\*\*

Posts: 1722

Karma: 0

Veritas Staff

[View Profile](#)

Re: New level of skepticism

« Reply #26 on: July 10, 2006, 05:37:00 PM »

I politely call machinechimera's attention to the quote feature, simply because that would make his posts all the more legible Cheesy.

Quote from: MachineChimera on July 10, 2006, 05:19:02 PM

Lots less to be found in terms of readily accessible proof, than in denial and rejection? Uh... what? Have you -read- some of the malarchy bandied about on these topics? People claim to CHANGE THE TEMPERATURE in the room, move things with their minds, create psychic balls of floating, colorful energy, or to be able to read peoples' thoughts, or know things about people that they couldn't know otherwise. ALL of these things are EASILY, readily provable, if they are capable of being done. You go into a lab, say "you're wrong, scientists. Watch this" And then you demonstrate. Eh.. what's the hold up? Oooooooooohh.. right. That -reality- factor, where none of this

actually exists. I keep forgetting about that. ;p

For what its worth, I'll note that I've never heard anyone (well, anyone decently reputable) claim to be able to actually create a "ball of glowing light." As for the rest of these spiffy effects in relation to laboratory tests... surprisingly enough, its not that simple. As it turns out, tests have been done where a bunch of scientists get together and, in a laboratory setting, watch some semi-famous psychic or mentalist do some amazing magical feat; the results were published, talked about, and so forth. However, these tests have very little impact because, predictably, they are by and large the result of stage magicians duping a bunch of innocent scientists. The key issue is reproducible experiments (just like in the rest of science), and if some great and powerful, real psion shows up in a lab and does such-and-such amazing feats, it doesn't matter much because this can't be reproduced without that guy being around- so he can easily be written off as a trickster (extraordinary theories requiring extraordinary results, and all that). ...Thats the long explanation, in either case. The shorter explanation is that if you go to a bunch of scientists and ask to have them watch you bend a spoon, they'll either laugh or back away nervously, and none of the few thousand-so people who probably could do such things reliably want to bother Cheesy.

All of which aside, of course, we're still waiting for Kobok to trot out his standard-issue references to the field of parapsychology, which has (through the use of random number generators and double-blind tests, and other clever things) produced truly reproducible experimental evidence for the existence of psi.

Logged

Act; for the universe will never forget your movement, nor will it ever forgive your stillness.

MachineChimera

Settling In

\*

Posts: 37

Karma: 0

[View Profile](#)

Re: New level of skepticm

« Reply #27 on: July 10, 2006, 06:07:49 PM »

Quote

I politely call machinechimera's attention to the quote feature, simply because that would make his posts all the more legible .

Quote

Quote from: MachineChimera on Today at 05:19:02 PM

Lots less to be found in terms of readily accessible proof, than in denial and rejection? Uh... what? Have you -read- some of the malarchy bandied about on these topics?



People claim to CHANGE THE TEMPERATURE in the room, move things with their minds, create psychic balls of floating, colorful energy, or to be able to read peoples' thoughts, or know things about people that they couldn't know otherwise. ALL of these things are EASILY, readily provable, if they are capable of being done. You go into a lab, say "you're wrong, scientists. Watch this" And then you demonstrate. Eh.. what's the hold up? Oooooooooohh.. right. That -reality- factor, where none of this actually exists. I keep forgetting about that. ;p

For what its worth, I'll note that I've never heard anyone (well, anyone decently reputable) claim to be able to actually create a "ball of glowing light." As for the rest of these spiffy effects in relation to laboratory tests... surprisingly enough, its not that simple. As it turns out, tests have been done where a bunch of scientists get together and, in a laboratory setting, watch some semi-famous psychic or mentalist do some amazing magical feat; the results were published, talked about, and so forth. However, these tests have very little impact because, predictably, they are by and large the result of stage magicians duping a bunch of innocent scientists. The key issue is reproducible experiments (just like in the rest of science), and if some great and powerful, real psion shows up in a lab and does such-and-such amazing feats, it doesn't matter much because this can't be reproduced without that guy being around- so he can easily be written off as a trickster (extraordinary theories requiring extraordinary results, and all that). ...Thats the long explanation, in either case. The shorter explanation is that if you go to a bunch of scientists and ask to have them watch you bend a spoon, they'll either laugh or back away nervously, and none of the few thousand-so people who probably could do such things reliably want to bother .

All of which aside, of course, we're still waiting for Kobok to trot out his standard-issue references to the field of parapsychology, which has (through the use of random number generators and double-blind tests, and other clever things) produced truly reproducible experimental evidence for the existence of psi. - Zake

Heh.. I'd love to see those standard issue references, m'self. \*grin\* But the instance you mentioned IS reproducible: nobody else even has to be able to do it, so long as that great and powerful Psion can do it. If he can move things with his mind repeatedly, before anybody that states otherwise, he's pretty much proven it. They might not be able to explain it or say it's a world wide phenomena, but they can at least verify that Yes, -that- man has that ability. That would be "proof." That's what frustrates me so much, in part, honestly: people run around talking about this stuff like it's real. Like someone actually has ever been able to do that. Nobody, ever, has been able to man up to the claim in that fashion. That's proof all it's own that, either the people that claim they can do it aren't so sure they can, or that they know it's outright crap, on some level, and don't want to have to prove it to themselves by having other people point out how they can't do it in person. Mf. And I doubt it's a matter of 'don't want to bother.' I mean, the male psychology, for instance. When I put up 245 on bench press, I was proud as hell. I ran around telling -everybody- I hung out with. I was eager to show them. It was something to be proud of.. something not everybody

can do, dig? You score 1300+ on SAT's, you tell people. You show them the paper to prove it. Same with an award. Place big in a national martial arts competition, you keep the trophy. So you can show people. Hell, kids flip their lids talking trash and eager to demonstrate just the ability to kick someone else's ass in a certain video game, or bragging about a code or combination they know. If people could actually manipulate the weather by some occult power, or move things with their mind, etc, etc, I gaurandamnTee you there'd be people coming out of the wordwork eager to show people what they could do, get that extra, special attention and fame, the money, etc.

Edit: Added quote boxes for easier reading. ~Crowley

« Last Edit: July 11, 2006, 05:48:26 AM by Crowley » Logged

Zake

Veritas Staff

Veritas Moderator

Posts By Osmosis

\*\*\*\*\*

Posts: 1722

Karma: 0

Veritas Staff

[View Profile](#)

Re: New level of skepticm

« Reply #28 on: July 10, 2006, 07:44:35 PM »

Quote from: MachineChimera on July 10, 2006, 06:07:49 PM

That's what frustrates me so much, in part, honestly: people run around talking about this stuff like it's real. Like someone actually has ever been able to do that. Nobody, ever, has been able to man up to the claim in that fashion. That's proof all it's own that, either the people that claim they can do it aren't so sure they can, or that they know it's outright crap, on some level, and don't want to have to prove it to themselves by having other people point out how they can't do it in person. Mf.

And thats what frusterates me so much, that people assume that their own more-or-less arbitrary definiton of what would happen if it were real infallibly reflects what is actually true. It is sort of strange, yah, that no one has had the chutzpah to go up to the developed, media-connected world and get some inexplicable power validated- however, strange doesn't mean impossible, so give us a break. One could come up with all manner of credible reasons why they wouldn't have. For the first example- could the great and powerful psion overturn the entirety of scientific thought that doesn't allow for psi? Even if sufficient scientists were willing to undertake what would be inconvenient and extremely dubious experiments, most "consistent" psionic abilities (telepathy, for example) are such that they could be faked by a sufficiently skilled

trickster, and therefore the entire series of experiments involving this person could be dismissed. As for not bothering... well, in our society we can be pretty sure that humongous bench presses and lofty SAT scores can get us some high praise and nice opportunities, but that's far different from proving psi. The thought of being the "OMG PSI!!" person who gets tested by legions of scientists and on some of the most controversial headlines of the decade would be so daunting you can't blame those few powerful persons from backing away from the notion (especially if they've seen the X-men movies Cheesy). The argument of "but someone would have done it" doesn't really apply when there are so few persons (or magicians, or whatever) skilled enough to produce the right effects reliably.

This is an issue that has come up pretty often around here, and the general opinion has been that the likelihood that the nonexistence of mainstream "proof" invalidates psi is less than the likelihood that all the other evidence we have ourselves experienced validates it (that's why we're all here, obviously).

As for those standard issue references, you may notice that my mention of it up there was a link to the appropriate veritas wiki page. Some of those links should lead to useful sources on the topic.

Logged

Act; for the universe will never forget your movement, nor will it ever forgive your stillness.

Forg

The V' Smithy

Posts By Osmosis

\*\*\*\*\*

Posts: 827

Karma: 20

[View Profile](#)

Re: New level of skepticism

« Reply #29 on: July 10, 2006, 09:38:53 PM »

Can't prove it, hmm, I'm pretty sure I can prove it actually. Don't recall saying that I couldn't. I also don't recall being told by any scientists I couldn't either. But I'm glad to see you won't because it's so above you as you 'know for a fact' that it's untrue.

Now I agree with you to the point where it's quite easy to delude oneself to a degree where you believe what is in fact 'untrue' but remains true to you as one builds his or her reality. And I could very well be deluded to this point. But it has been to a degree where I can cause an effect on others' reality by simply showing them \*gasp\*

But in this era of immense technology, an era where there couldn't possibly be

anything else to prove, I wont. I'm not Jesus and I really don't care if you believe in this or not, but it is pretty fun to watch you try and save the masses of those suffering children who do believe. A noble goal, you should spread the word. Stop us before we fly away off the bridge, because I can, wanna see?

(if it really concerns you all too much, I have a shitty psiwheel video you can disprove if you'd like to see it, PM me)

« Last Edit: July 10, 2006, 09:40:27 PM by Forg »      Logged

Be your own light, your own refuge. Believe only that which you test for yourself. Do not accept authority merely because it comes from a great man, or is written in a sacred book, for truth is different for each man and woman." -- Buddha

Pages: 1 [2] 3 4 ... 9Print

« previous next »

Jump to:

=> Main Hall

Powered by MySQL Powered by PHP    Powered by SMF 1.1.18 | SMF © 2013, Simple Machines

Oxygen design by Bloc    Valid XHTML 1.0! Valid CSS!

<http://forums.vrsociety.net/index.php/topic%2C8667.30.html>

2 captures

7 Jul 2010 - 24 Apr 2013

Jul    APR    May

24

2010   2013   2014

About this capture

The Veritas Society

\*

\*HomeForumsChatHelpSearchRetroLoginRegister

Welcome, Guest. Please login or register.

Did you miss your activation email?

April 24, 2013, 03:24:33 PM

Forever

Login with username, password and session length

Search:

Advanced search

207176 Posts in 14721 Topics by 18392 Members - Latest Member: - Nikko  
online today: 94 - most online ever: 430 (June 28, 2007, 02:58:51 PM)

Most

+ The Veritas Society

| -+ The Auditorium

| | -+ Main Hall

| | | -+ New level of skepticism      0 Members and 1 Guest are viewing this topic. «  
previous next »

Pages: 1 2 [3] 4 5 ... 9      Print

Author      Topic: New level of skepticism (Read 15027 times)

kobok

Veritas Council

Tech Team

Posts By Osmosis

\*\*\*\*\*

Posts: 4737

Karma: 145

Veritas Council

View Profile

Re: New level of skepticism

« Reply #30 on: July 10, 2006, 11:52:44 PM »

Quote from: solstice on July 10, 2006, 08:29:16 AM

Hey, Kobot, aint you a reputable scientist? <G>

Heheh. Well, they keep giving me a paycheck, so at least somebody thinks so.  
Smiley

Quote from: MachineChimera on July 10, 2006, 05:54:51 AM

First off, let me start with a greeting to all present, since I'm the new guy.

Welcome. I hope you enjoy the discussion here. Smiley

Quote from: MachineChimera on July 10, 2006, 05:54:51 AM

Metaphysics, like all branches of Philosophy, is entirely a soft science. Consider the definition "Soft science is a colloquial term, often used pejoratively, for academic research or scholarship which is purportedly "scientific" while its adherence to or rigor of scientific method is considered to be soft, not based on reproducible experimental data and/or a mathematical explanation of that data."

By nature, you cannot "demand proof" for any soft science, since they are by and large matters for which data is considered qualitative, instead've quantitatively. The "proof" I have demanded is qualitative proof.. evidence in demonstration and application of use. I have not demanded that someone should point out the energy behind the supposed forces in question, or their laws of operation, or so on, so much as demanded that

someone make reliable, demonstrative use of it before entities capable of reliably qualifying it as valid.

(It's difficult to tell which parts are your writing, but I will do my best. If you use the "Insert Quote" link in the posts beneath the edit window, it will be easier to distinguish your writing from that of the people you are referring to.)

I think if we're going to argue definitions, we should be careful. First, we must sensibly agree that there are two separate and distinct definitions of "metaphysics" and "metaphysical" that are in active use across the English speaking world. First, there is metaphysics the classical philosophy. Second, there are the metaphysical arts studied here, such as psi, chi, magick, etc. These two definitions have about as much in common as physics and physical activity. I would be a bit of a moron if I were to claim that gym teachers don't know what they're talking about because they call it physical education but don't teach physics.

So let's simply accept that there are two distinct uses, one of which is a classical philosophy (not of interest in this discussion), and one of which involves an art, practice, path, trade, or skill.

There is a completely SEPARATE word for the science involving the metaphysical arts, and that science is called "parapsychology". While the metaphysical arts are more concerned with the practical application of the field of interest, parapsychology is more interested in the rigorous and scientific study and investigation of the properties of this area.

It would not be fair to expect the metaphysical arts to be at all times scientific in the methods of their practice (just as you would not expect sports players to be at all times scientific in the methods of their practice). It would also not be fair to expect each of the results of parapsychology to be directly applied to everyday life, as this is not the primary focus of parapsychology.

Quote from: MachineChimera on July 10, 2006, 05:54:51 AM

Mostly correct in so much as the overall tone of the disagreement, save that you have erred on the point of assumptive ignorance, in the same fashion as Darknen did. I've studied occultism in myriad forms from likely the same sources most of you have, I should think, which traditionally comes in written format. Also, my point is not 'no reputable scientist believe it', so much as the reason why no reputable scientist believes in such; a lack of logical reason to do so.

Well, if we're going to discuss reason and science, let's do it right. When I'm investigating a new scientific area, the first thing I do is usually a literature search. If you try to form an opinion without first turning to the authoritative textbooks or journal articles in a subject, then it is quite likely your opinion will be quite pseudoscientific in its nature, even if it sounds "reasonable" to your everyday instincts.

So how many parapsychology journal articles did you read before forming this conclusion? An order of magnitude estimate will do... 1000? 100? 10? 1? Less than 1?

Quote from: MachineChimera

Let a renown mathematician make the same claim, and I can guarantee he'll get coverage and inquiry.

Mathematician, eh? How about a fairly well-educated mathematician, statistician, and author of four statistics textbooks named Jessica Utts? (please click that link) Oh, and coincidentally, the author who takes the mere secondary position on that paper is Brian Josephson, winner of the Nobel Prize in physics, and inventor of the Josephson junction.

Quote from: MachineChimera

So, it's common knowledge that, under the right conditions, a person's brain can tell them all manner of things that aren't actually true. -Especially- when someone really, really wants to believe something badly enough.

Now on this you and I definitely agree. Smiley But have you stopped to consider how this principle affects your own beliefs about this matter? Do you not find yourself with a philosophical predisposition which is strongly tinting the words and statements said to you by others?

Quote from: MachineChimera

... And then you demonstrate. Eh.. what's the hold up?

Been there, done that, didn't like the resulting publicity and reactions of others. The reactions of others include astonishment, incredulity, fear, withdrawal, and a number of similar emotional effects. And then of course, those who witness it tell others, and soon everyone wants a demonstration, up until the point you say no, and then the ones you say no to don't believe you, while some of the ones you demonstrate it for try to find ways to wipe it out of their mind or explain it away in any method that will let them return to their previous comfortable beliefs.

So as a personal rule, I don't "do" demonstrations anymore. Since after all, what's the point when, like you said, "a person's brain can tell them all manner of things that aren't actually true. -Especially- when someone really, really wants to believe something badly enough."

So the argument is best made in a more gentle fashion, by the calm and careful pointing to a massive body of scientific evidence with which you would do well to familiarize yourself.

Zake already provided you with a link to an excellent starting point. And the best place to start is to read the book mentioned there, *The Conscious Universe*, by psychologist

Dean Radin. It contains a fairly lengthy set of references (also available from a link on that page without actually reading the book, but the book is definitely worth reading). Those references would provide a solid launching point for any serious perusal of the scientific literature on this subject.

Logged  
MachineChimera  
Settling In  
\*

Posts: 37  
Karma: 0

[View Profile](#)

Re: New level of skepticm

« Reply #31 on: July 11, 2006, 04:53:42 AM »

Quote

"Welcome. I hope you enjoy the discussion here. "

Thank you. I have thusfar, and expect I shall continue to do so, with any luck. ;d

Quote

"I think if we're going to argue definitions, we should be careful. First, we must sensibly agree that there are two separate and distinct definitions of "metaphysics" and "metaphysical" that are in active use across the English speaking world. First, there is metaphysics the classical philosophy. Second, there are the metaphysical arts studied here, such as psi, chi, magick, etc. These two definitions have about as much in common as physics and physical activity. I would be a bit of a moron if I were to claim that gym teachers don't know what they're talking about because they call it physical education but don't teach physics.

So let's simply accept that there are two distinct uses, one of which is a classical philosophy (not of interest in this discussion), and one of which involves an art, practice, path, trade, or skill."

We are indeed going to argue over definitions here, I fear. We do not sensibly agree that there are two seperate and distinct definitions of "metaphysics" and "metaphysical" in active use across the English speaking world. There is one distinct, actual, proper definition for these words in use across the English speaking world, and there is another meaning that is used in this community evidently, in a fashion outside it's actual proper meaning, to include things that are not at all metaphysical, but rather paranormal or parapsychological, if you prefer. Why you didn't simply opt for an accurate choice of descriptor, instead've a word that might otherwise seem to lend some false shroud of credibility and rational thought to the topics at hand, I cannot fathom.



#### Quote

"There is a completely SEPARATE word for the science involving the metaphysical arts, and that science is called "parapsychology". While the metaphysical arts are more concerned with the practical application of the field of interest, parapsychology is more interested in the rigorous and scientific study and investigation of the properties of this area."

Again, I will raise the point that what you are discussing here are not 'metaphysical arts', but rather paranormal, or parapsychological. I'm well familiar with both terms, though you seem to talk about it in a fashion indicative of a failing on my part in that regard. Pedagoguesque tone aside, I'm sure you intended well in doing so. I'll address that assumption later in this response, however. Parapsychology is interested in the actual investigation and validation of such claims and possibilities as are mentioned here. What you call "metaphysical arts" is nothing more, and no different than, the same wand-waving, crystal chanting, circle drawing, sigil and power-word invocation that has survived under the same generic principles and individual methodologies since the dark ages, at the least.

#### Quote

"It would not be fair to expect the metaphysical arts to be at all times scientific in the methods of their practice (just as you would not expect sports players to be at all times scientific in the methods of their practice). It would also not be fair to expect each of the results of parapsychology to be directly applied to everyday life, as this is not the primary focus of parapsychology."

It would indeed be fair, if they truly were at all a study as to the veracity and truth of what was being discussed, much less their "applications". It is only not fair to expect such, when one's primary focus of study is not to verify the truth or actuality of the 'metaphysical arts', so much as to indulge in the discussion of same as though they were indeed, factual, instead've non-conclusive, unproven theories that have been around mostly in unchanged forms for centuries.

#### Quote

"Well, if we're going to discuss reason and science, let's do it right. When I'm investigating a new scientific area, the first thing I do is usually a literature search. If you try to form an opinion without first turning to the authoritative textbooks or journal articles in a subject, then it is quite likely your opinion will be quite pseudoscientific in its nature, even if it sounds "reasonable" to your everyday instincts.

So how many parapsychology journal articles did you read before forming this conclusion? An order of magnitude estimate will do... 1000? 100? 10? 1? Less than 1?"

We entirely agree upon the principle of error in forming an idea without basis upon which to form valid idea/opinion. I spoke earlier as to the error of your assumption, and the tone in which you are asserting it both previously, and again, here, and will address

such now. Perhaps just over 100 texts, in estimation, as well as various psuedo-scientific articles relating to the subject(s). I'll reiterate, since you missed it before I think, that I studied the occult myself (a phase that, thankfully, I rationally woke from before become as immersed as some of the others here seem to be) for nearly 3 years. So, if you seek to insinuate that I'm criticizing something I've no factual knowledge about, you insinuate in error.

#### Quote

"Mathematician, eh? How about a fairly well-educated mathematician, statistician, and author of four statistics textbooks named Jessica Utts? (please click that link) Oh, and coincidentally, the author who takes the mere secondary position on that paper is Brian Josephson, winner of the Nobel Prize in physics, and inventor of the Josephson junction."

Mm, statistics. We have here information published on the nature of telepathic, clairvoyant, and perhaps precognitive investigations done both by the government and by civilian counterparts. I will start by stating that you note all of these tests discuss 'evidence' (not proof) of the above abilities, and that even your "fairly well-educated mathematician, statistician, and author of four statistics textbooks" along with the follow-on winner of the Nobel Prize in physics, offer only that even if such abilities as above mentioned exist, they perhaps only serve to increase the chance of knowing such things to a degree that might not even be statistically noteworthy or valid without an extended number of attempts. This assertion itself, they field on a fair number of possibilities and "if's." Further, you will note that is TWO supports in a community FULL of vastly more accomplished skeptics and more educated beings, as well as the overwhelming majority of other Noble Prize winners, who would disagree and do not share their findings. Also, I'll note that they do not open the floor to critical review and assessment of their findings and assertions by their peers in the scientific community; they only present their perception of the relevance of the findings, and in doing so actually make mention that the success rate of these so-called 'gifted' individuals is statistically very low. They attempt to spin that by claiming that the talent might be an assistance factor, not an actual power that's always on. The words she used were "1/3 instead've 1/4th" for example?

Ironically, she is a credible statistician, with a credible scientific backer, that accounts for an infinitesimally small portion of a percent of community that by and large, disagrees with her entirely. Cheesy

#### Quote

"Now on this you and I definitely agree. But have you stopped to consider how this principle affects your own beliefs about this matter? Do you not find yourself with a philosophical predisposition which is strongly tinting the words and statements said to you by others"

I have, and was waiting for someone to take this direction. I'm pleased I didn't have to wait long. That principle affects all of us to mutual degree. The difference is that I am forming rational assertions and using the tools of logic and rational thought to

pursue my viewpoint, and thereby have some modicum of buffer to natural, emotional discolorations of opinion, whereas those supporting this paranormal bunkery are not. I will demonstrate several of those courses of logic, by which, even without independent study upon the subject at hand, one might easily arrive upon the rational belief that psychic abilities and magic are fallacies. A) A thing does not directly create/induce its opposite. We see this throughout our existence, and that opposites are generally of a negating quality, not a productive one. Wherefor, an intangible force cannot affect a physical or solid force. An intangible force or effect cannot become tangible, and neither the reverse. If you believe otherwise, please list an example that does one of the above. B) If a thing exists, it exists always, unless some greater force acts in cancellation/destruction. If someone has a talent, that talent is always present. Someone that can play chess very well, can always play chess very well. It doesn't come and go with concentration or skeptic watchers. A talented basketball player is always a talented basketball player, in so far as the talent goes, outside of exterior detrimental effects like age, injury, drugs, etc. Even on an "off" day, he or she is better than the average player, and the talent even on an off day is noticeable. C) Real things that are fantastical and sensational, are generally well known. Many people know about the baby in Germany that's 'super strong' due to a strange birth defect that left him without the genes that account for the atrophy of unused muscle. World records, like the fastest running man, the strongest lifting, etc, are well documented. If such fantastical, sensational powers like the ability to lift or move objects with the mind really existed, they'd be well documented as fact, and well known. There'd be names in world record books, as to who could move the most mentally, or who's the most accurate precognitive, etc, etc.

#### Quote

"Been there, done that, didn't like the resulting publicity and reactions of others. The reactions of others include astonishment, incredulity, fear, withdrawal, and a number of similar emotional effects. And then of course, those who witness it tell others, and soon everyone wants a demonstration, up until the point you say no, and then the ones you say no to don't believe you, while some of the ones you demonstrate it for try to find ways to wipe it out of their mind or explain it away in any method that will let them return to their previous comfortable beliefs."

Of -course- you did. Praytell, what "publicity" did you get? Where was the account published or televised? And who did you "perform" these mindboggling feats before, I wonder? Stage magicians often induce the same reactions you describe. I suppose that makes their "magic" real, too, mm? What you describe is the general course for talented people like gifted intellectuals doing rubik-cube puzzles, or athletes that sprint or lift very well. Yet they don't go into hiding to avoid the attention. I suppose the difference is they can actually prove they can do what they do. Or perhaps the "metaphysical" (as the term is used here) nature of your arts makes it the exception: gifted practitioners avoid attention, all while making public discussion of it on the internet. Yet another 'exception' to the rule of comparable situations. And yet another logical reason to write off such fantastical claims: when a large number of exceptions to standard rules pile up around something, it's usually bogus. The most common

example of such a pattern would be a hard to believe lie. Sure, it could be true, but people disbelieve it, except for the gullible, because of such a pattern. "Your.. aunt is going to die, and you need to be there for her... on the Friday you've been trying to get off work for the past month now? We can't call the doctor because he doesn't have a phone, though? He wrote you by mail to let you know? ... But you can't show us the letter he wrote you to inform you, because your dog ate it?" Indeed. Also, you use words that seem to be of the mein of painting people that don't operate under your viewpoint of the possible and rational as sheepish retreatists, trying to purge from their mind concepts they can't understand or don't want to remember... as though witnessing such a thing is somehow traumatic. I'll note that firstly, none of the government or civilian enterprises studying this sort've thing, experience such a traumatic response to protect the psyche by explaining it out of thought. Secondly, that would not be the response most would have. If people had demonstrated to them such a feat of magickal or psychic power.. of any supernatural effect, honestly, they'd be clamoring to learn it themselves, not regressing from it. Who wouldn't want such an ability? I suspect the desire to have such power and be that special is foremost on most of the minds of individuals that get into this sort've thing in the first place, regardless of whatever higher, universally altruistic nobilities of desire to improve the self you might contrive. People envy power and abilities, they're not traumatized by them, so that description is both inaccurate and entirely not in following with the human behavior, quite frankly. I'm forced to wonder why you'd assume such a thing was the reason they'd explain it away, in fact.. as again, when a person makes an assumption, it's strongly colored by their own perspectives. Such would indicate that you.. feel superior to people that don't believe in such nonsense, and believe that you have a more 'open' mind, and are able to 'grasp' concepts that would disturb 'mundane' people. Interesting.

#### Quote

"So the argument is best made in a more gentle fashion, by the calm and careful pointing to a massive body of scientific evidence with which you would do well to familiarize yourself.

#### Quote

Zake already provided you with a link to an excellent starting point. And the best place to start is to read the book mentioned there, *The Conscious Universe*, by psychologist Dean Radin. It contains a fairly lengthy set of references (also available from a link on that page without actually reading the book, but the book is definitely worth reading). Those references would provide a solid launching point for any serious perusal of the scientific literature on this subject."

Annnnd once again you condescend in error. \*Wry grin.\* You assume in ignorance that a skeptic doesn't know the nature of what he's criticizing. You assume that a skeptic forms an uneducated opinion, rather than arriving at skepticism as the rational, logical conclusion AFTER the research of the subject being belabored. Since you seem fond of pointing to supporting links, shall I begin giving you links for a good place to start along the rational, logical approach to reality and critical thinking, by linking the

NUMEROUS, overwhelming scientific resources that debunk psychic and magical claims, or skeptical sites that would further educate you as to the mysteries of the error of thinking involved in harboring such a belief system? I can only, as you have, make the assumption that you have not made a study of rational thought and logical thinking. Shall I point you in that direction as well? Grin

Edit: Added quote boxes for easier reading ~Crowley

« Last Edit: July 11, 2006, 07:27:37 AM by MachineChimera »

Logged

Mobius

Veritas Council

Veritas Furniture

\*\*\*\*\*

Posts: 324

Karma: 25

Fundamental Psi Coordinator

[View Profile](#)

Re: New level of skepticism

« Reply #32 on: July 11, 2006, 07:50:57 AM »

Quote from: Machine Chimera

I'll reiterate, since you missed it before I think, that I studied the occult myself (a phase that, thankfully, I rationally woke from before become as immersed as some of the others here seem to be) for nearly 3 years.

I am curious, where, what, and possibly under who did you study?

Logged

Deus Ex Vir

MachineChimera

Settling In

\*

Posts: 37

Karma: 0

[View Profile](#)

Re: New level of skepticism

« Reply #33 on: July 11, 2006, 08:01:30 AM »

Quote from: `Gemini on July 11, 2006, 07:50:57 AM

Quote from: Machine Chimera

I'll reiterate, since you missed it before I think, that I studied the occult myself (a phase that, thankfully, I rationally woke from before become as immersed as some of the others here seem to be) for nearly 3 years.

I am curious, where, what, and possibly under who did you study?

Various texts drawn from libraries, and internet resources secondarily. I was a heavy book worm in my early teen years, and bounced around a lot thanks to a military family. I read all manner of paranormal/occult literature at the time... I thought the ideas of magick and psychic powers were fascinating, and even went so far as to read into angelic thrones and demonology, aside from regular theological readings. Meh. I also read heavily into ghosts and "hauntings", and additionally in a somewhat related note, branched into philosophy, at which point I began honing a more logical edge. I'm especially fond of human behavioral philosophies, ethics, and theoretical physics.

« Last Edit: July 11, 2006, 08:11:11 AM by MachineChimera »      Logged

Big Boss

Friggen Crazy

Veritas Moderator

Posts By Osmosis

\*\*\*\*\*

Posts: 1458

Karma: 3

Owner of 100000 V-Points

[View Profile WWW](#)

Re: New level of skepticm

« Reply #34 on: July 11, 2006, 08:22:05 AM »

Quote

We are indeed going to argue over definitions here, I fear. We do not sensibly agree that there are two seperate and distinct definitions of "metaphysics" and "metaphysical" in active use across the English speaking world. There is one distinct, actual, proper definition for these words in use across the English speaking world, and there is another meaning that is used in this community evidently, in a fashion outside it's actual proper meaning, to include things that are not at all metaphysical, but rather paranormal or parapsychological, if you prefer. Why you didn't simply opt for an accurate choice of descriptor, instead've a word that might otherwise seem to lend some false shroud of credibility and rational thought to the topics at hand, I cannot fathom.

just on a sidenote of word definition. Words can mean whatever you want them to mean, just like "gay" used to mean happy and now means offensive and homosexual (two definitions) and "sweet" used to mean... well, sweet. now it can mean sweet,

exciting, awesome etc.

Richard Dawkins wrote in his book "The Selfish Gene" that, "Human suffering has been caused because too many of us cannot grasp that words are only tools for our use, and that the mere presence in the dictionary of a word like 'living' does not mean it necessarily has to refer to something definite in the real world."

This word thing makes a fair analogy to parapsychology as well. The words surrounding it don't make it exist (or not exist). They simply try to make us understand logically something society has told us for years is "impossible."

Quote

It is only not fair to expect such, when one's primary focus of study is not to verify the truth or actuality of the 'metaphysical arts', so much as to indulge in the discussion of same as though they were indeed, factual, instead've non-conclusive, unproven theories that have been around mostly in unchanged forms for centuries.

Unproven theories huh? There are lots of unproven theories in the scientific world. In fact, the scientific world doesn't try to prove anything. they try to disprove. In my Advanced physical science class (fancy title for physics) I learned that a theory only exists when there is nothing to disprove it. Nothing in the scientific world has been proven. You really can't "prove" anything, you can only come up with a substantial amount of evidence surrounding it to convince the masses that it is "true" which, I learned on my first day in philosophy 1000, that you also cannot prove "truth" because truth is a word that implies a belief based on your perception of "reality."

Quote

Then you say "you were a bit biased, understandably because the scientific evidence strongly supports your theory"

Well, in general, we get three choices:

1. Choosing our opinions in favor of the evidence.
2. Drawing no conclusion.
3. Most likely being wrong.

The stronger the evidence gets, the wiser it is to choose category #1. In addition, when there IS evidence supporting the conclusion drawn, and when the existing evidence primarily, strongly, or exclusively supports one conclusion, then it certainly doesn't fit the standard definition of "bias", as it is neither "unfair" nor "prejudice" to draw a conclusion from the evidence.

Can you present any evidence for a distance dependence of psi which cannot already be explained by modulation due to expectations?

This quote is by Kobok in an earlier debate I had with him. The subject matter is moot

for this particular discussion, but he makes a valid point in number 1. Our beliefs in psionics or metaphysics or tacos or gravity even are really just opinions to coexist with the evidence pertaining to the subject. (I'd also like to add that as of now in the scientific community, there is no explanation for the existence of gravity. We can measure it, and we can predict its movements, much like a somewhat well established telepath can predict the action of metaphysical energy. but in both instances, we don't know exactly what it is that makes them work.

Quote

A) A thing does not directly create/induce it's opposite. We see this throughout our existence, and that opposites are generally of a negating quality, not a productive one. Wherefor, an intangible force cannot affect a physical or solid force. An intangible force or effect cannot become tangible, and neither the reverse. If you believe otherwise, please list an example that does one of the above.  
there is your example. Gravity is not tangible, but it affects physical matter, and radial matter, such as light waves.)

Logged

Join my Folding@Home team and do some good! #159490

Details at <http://folding.stanford.edu/>

MachineChimera

Settling In

\*

Posts: 37

Karma: 0

[View Profile](#)

Re: New level of skepticism

« Reply #35 on: July 11, 2006, 08:44:17 AM »

Quote

just on a sidenote of word definition. Words can mean whatever you want them to mean, just like "gay" used to mean happy and now means offensive and homosexual (two definitions) and "sweet" used to mean... well, sweet. now it can mean sweet, exciting, awesome etc.

Richard Dawkins wrote in his book "The Selfish Gene" that, "Human suffering has been caused because too many of us cannot grasp that words are only tools for our use, and that the mere presence in the dictionary of a word like 'living' does not mean it necessarily has to refer to something definite in the real world."

This word thing makes a fair analogy to parapsychology as well. The words surrounding it don't make it exist (or not exist). They simply try to make us understand logically something society has told us for years is "impossible."



Technically correct, just as it is technically correct to say that, as language and words are a tool for communication, and valid only in that regard alone, a tool is not valid for communication unless everyone has the same grasp or understanding of the tool. A word, like a symbol, a flare, or any other signal, is not an effective tool and is indeed worthless, if the people that are going to use it do not have a common understanding of what exactly that signal is to equate to. Which is why a word holds a certain meaning to the general populous. If a very small group uses a word to mean something different, for which there are already other meaningful 'signals'/words, they are not only needlessly avoiding the already existant words more properly 'meaningful' in that equation, but are going to also needlessly confuse others outside their grouping. Such confusion is against the specific intent of a word having common meaning in the first place: to avoid confusion and save time of explanation by having a common grounds understanding of interpretation.

#### Quote

Unproven theories huh? There are lots of unproven theories in the scientific world. In fact, the scientific world doesn't try to prove anything. they try to disprove. In my Advanced physical science class (fancy title for physics) I learned that a theory only exists when there is nothing to disprove it. Nothing in the scientific world has been proven. You really can't "prove" anything, you can only come up with a substantial amount of evidence surrounding it to convince the masses that it is "true" which, I learned on my first day in philosophy 1000, that you also cannot prove "truth" because truth is a word that implies a belief based on your perception of "reality."

Yes, that is the definition of a Theory: Something that can neither be proven or disproven. Theories however, are considered valid or not, in the absentia of ability to prove them, by supporting evidence, such as when associative mathematical formula taking into account a theoretical value, work out correctly and are seen to be applicable, indicative of a degree of veracity in measure to the observable results dependant upon theoretical value's inclusion. That is what seperates all theories from being equally valid or not, and why some Theories are as useful as facts, nearly, while others are worthless concoctions. Also, while nothing can be -actually- proven, as Thomas Hume already asserted, society and all it's individuals cannot function without the assumption that some things -are- proven/facts "within reasonable doubt." Things cannot be proven, but things can be proven "within reasonable doubt." Such is the foundation for necessary assumptions, without which you could not formulate courses of action with any degree of efficiency, or a modicum of development, as advancement is based upon moving past what is already discovered or used, and you could not advance anything without the assumption that a thing will function, under a certain set of variables, consistantly. We operate under this capacity every day; for example, you do not treat your computer as though it were a nuclear bomb that would go off if you touch the keyboard. You assume that it is, in fact, a computer, and that computers do not behave this way in general, and further that if you use the computer in meaningful ways that have functioned before, i.e. keystrokes, that the characters will be produced upon screen in such a fashion, and sent thus, instead've having to experiment with every key on your keyboard to figure out which key produces which. Which would, itself, be

useless, since such an experiment would rely upon the assumption that the keystrokes' values didn't change between the time you first struck them, and the next application meant to produce intended character. So, while you can invalidate any argument by stating that nothing can be proven, as has been done ad nauseam, such holds nothing of value in the context of just about any discussion, and if truly adhered to, would generate nothing of value, ever. It's something that's spoken of in factual context, but never used in actual, pragmatic existence.

Quote

This quote is by Kobok in an earlier debate I had with him. The subject matter is moot for this particular discussion, but he makes a valid point in number 1. Our beliefs in psionics or metaphysics or tacos or gravity even are really just opinions to coexist with the evidence pertaining to the subject. (I'd also like to add that as of now in the scientific community, there is no explanation for the existence of gravity. We can measure it, and we can predict its movements, much like a somewhat well established telepath can predict the action of metaphysical energy. but in both instances, we don't know exactly what it is that makes them work.

Quote

A) A thing does not directly create/induce it's opposite. We see this throughout our existence, and that opposites are generally of a negating quality, not a productive one. Wherefor, an intangible force cannot affect a physical or solid force. An intangible force or effect cannot become tangible, and neither the reverse. If you believe otherwise, please list an example that does one of the above. there is your example. Gravity is not tangible, but it affects physical matter, and radial matter, such as light waves.)

Indeed, our opinions of such are opinions to coexist with the evidence pertaining to a subject. That is because, within the realm of a rational being and reasonable doubt's limits, evidence is useful to formulating decisions and courses of action. So the greater the body of evidence in support of an idea, the more valuable the idea becomes in regard to a rational being's decision-making process, in consideration of the subject and all things in relation to the subject itself. As to gravity, you have not evidently familiarized yourself with the gravitational theories of Stephen Hawking; gravity is, to the best of present scientific theory's consideration, a PHYSICAL force, resultant upon the body of a mass depressing the space around it as it occupies it, as if you were placing a rock onto a sheet of paper. If you have a blanket stretched taut for example, and put a few items around the center, and then put a heavy object into the center of the blanket, it would -pull- the surrounding items toward that center of depression, as the fabric is being pulled in that direction. You can read his work directly for a much more technical evaluation, and I'm sure you'll find he puts it in better analogy than I do, but do definitely read up on his theories about gravitational force. As it stands however, the scientific community, as Mr. Hawking, categorize gravity as a PHYSICAL force, the results of a physical mass taking up space within the fabric of space itself.

Logged

Big Boss

Friggen Crazy

Veritas Moderator  
Posts By Osmosis

\*\*\*\*\*

Posts: 1458  
Karma: 3

Owner of 100000 V-Points

[View Profile WWW](#)

Re: New level of skepticism  
« Reply #36 on: July 11, 2006, 09:01:53 AM »

Quote

So, while you can invalidate any argument by stating that nothing can be proven, as has been done ad nauseam, such holds nothing of value in the context of just about any discussion, and if truly adhered to, would generate nothing of value, ever. It's something that's spoken of in factual context, but never used in actual, pragmatic existence.

Just as I can invalidate anything you can say with that (and gaining nothing, I understand) you can do the same with the opposite. You can evidently give us evidence (which I haven't seen yet. please produce. We did our part in coming up with references and links to provide evidence to our cause, it's only fair that you put in the same amount of effort.) to "prove" we are wrong, and we can give evidence to "prove" the opposite. I think we both know, and maybe we both refuse to acknowledge, that this whole debate will boil down to, "Nuh uh!" and "Uh huh!" "I'm right," "No! I'm right." It really comes down to personal belief. I believe that we all need something to believe in, even if that something is nothing.

I'm actually pretty interested in hearing what your fellow skeptics have to say. I hypothesize that the behavior will be similar in that when we say, "Thank God I away from traditional materialistic belief. It's like so many doors have been opened, now that I'm not held back by conventional societal means." Sounds familiar to, "Thank God I got away from the occult. It's like so many doors have been opened, now that I'm not held back by those false beliefs."

Logged

Join my Folding@Home team and do some good! #159490

Details at <http://folding.stanford.edu/>

solstice

Dreamwalker

Posts By Osmosis

\*\*\*\*\*

Posts: 2114  
Karma: -6

"Receive and transmit..."

[View Profile](#)

Re: New level of skepticism

« Reply #37 on: July 11, 2006, 09:43:56 AM »

I am interested in the number degrees he has, which quantifies his assertions that no scientific evidence exists on this subject \*cough\*

Logged

Tell all the Truth but tell it slant: Success in Circuit lies. Too bright for our infirm Delight. The Truth's superb surprise. As Lightning to the Children eased, with explanation kind. The Truth must dazzle gradually, or every man be blind.

Tefeari: The Giant Impact Hypothesis is a theory

MachineChimera

Settling In

\*

Posts: 37  
Karma: 0

[View Profile](#)

Re: New level of skepticism

« Reply #38 on: July 11, 2006, 10:32:51 AM »

Quote

"Just as I can invalidate anything you can say with that (and gaining nothing, I understand) you can do the same with the opposite. You can evidently give us evidence (which I haven't seen yet. please produce. We did our part in coming up with references and links to provide evidence to our cause, it's only fair that you put in the same amount of effort.) to "prove" we are wrong, and we can give evidence to "prove" the opposite. I think we both know, and maybe we both refuse to acknowledge, that this whole debate will boil down to, "Nuh uh!" and "Uh huh!" "I'm right," "No! I'm right." It really comes down to personal belief. I believe that we all need something to believe in, even if that something is nothing.

I'm actually pretty interested in hearing what your fellow skeptics have to say. I hypothesize that the behavior will be similar in that when we say, "Thank God I away from traditional materialistic belief. It's like so many doors have been opened, now that I'm not held back by conventional societal means." Sounds familiar to, "Thank God I got

away from the occult. It's like so many doors have been opened, now that I'm not held back by those false beliefs." - Martial Thoughts"

As to evidence, generally the individual making a claim bears the burden of proof. You do not prove something doesn't exist, because you cannot.. it can always be argued that you simply haven't found it. Rather, something must be proven to exist (and again, we will use the word proof in the meaningful sense that is most commonly found in it's use.. Beyond all reasonable doubt.), when it is claimed to have been found or achieved. Notwithstanding, I've several resources gladly provided in that regard, detailing all manner of statistical evidences against "successful" psychic tests, clairvoyant readings, and a vast number of hoaxes and alledged claims, which seems to be the normal for this sort've matter. Always anecdotal stories, all talk, and no actual demonstration.

Books: The Demon-Haunted World: Science as a candle in the Dark, by Carl Sagan. I am Therefore I Think: A Skeptical Manifesto, by Michael Shermer. Truth, Knowledge, Or Just Plain Bull: How To Tell The Difference: A Handbook of Practical Logic and Clear Thinking, by Bernard Patten. Skeptical Odysseys: Personal Accounts by the World's Leading Paranormal Inquirers, as edited by Paul Kurtz. Pseudoscience and the Paranormal, 2nd edition, by Terence Hines. Secrets of the Psychics: Investigating Paranormal Claims, by Massimo Polidoro. The Psychology of the Psychic, by David Marks.

Also, the following weblinks are quite handy.

<http://www.skeptic.com/>

-<http://www.randi.org/> (You'll note he offered \$10,000 initially to ANYONE that could demonstrate actual psychic, supernatural, or paranormal powers. At present, the challenge amount is in excess of \$700,000.)

<http://www.csicop.org>

<http://www.csicop.org/si/9511/eyewitness.html>

<http://www.csicop.org/si/9603/claims.html>

<http://atheism.about.com/od/skepticismnews/>

<http://www.ntskeptics.org/>

Quote

"I am interested in the number degrees he has, which quantifies his assertions that no scientific evidence exists on this subject \*cough\*" -Solstice

I'm interested in the number of degrees you have, which qualifies your assertions of opinions regarding your various spookeries and psychic/magic thread submissions. \*Cough.\* Also, I'm interested in the number of years you've been speaking english, since you have repeated problems with spelling and grammar. Ooh, and as a side note, I'm interested as to what degree you have regarding understanding of words central to your hobbies, since you didn't actually know what the word metaphysics means, and sought to, laughably, accuse me before I joined this thread of not understanding the word's meaning myself. Perhaps you have a degree in Irony? Or is it in Hypocrisy, since you commented just a few back before it was removed by a mod

that personal attacks should be avoided, and that we should all act like adults, whether we were or not.

Anything else tickling your throat, or are you done coughing now? \*smirk.\*

Logged

solstice

Dreamwalker

Posts By Osmosis

\*\*\*\*\*

Posts: 2114

Karma: -6

"Receive and transmit..."

[View Profile](#)

Re: New level of skepticm

« Reply #39 on: July 11, 2006, 10:38:16 AM »

Answer the question, wise ass.

Now, we stoop to who speaks English better? Did you not agree to keep all the silliness out of this thread when a moderator spoke to you</rhetorical question>

Metaphysical (adj.)

2: Transcending physical matter.

Source: Oxford English Dictionary

Now, I am no scholar, but is Oxford not one of them fancy rich people schools, for learnin' and stuff?

In answer to your actual question: I would have to concede that your perception is correct, and that I practise "spookery" Since I do not adhere to your false pretence, there is no way to give you a truthful response. There is no magick/psychic forum here, so you may have to be more specific in the future.

« Last Edit: July 11, 2006, 11:12:58 AM by solstice » Logged

Tell all the Truth but tell it slant: Success in Circuit lies. Too bright for our infirm Delight. The Truth's superb surprise. As Lightning to the Children eased, with explanation kind. The Truth must dazzle gradually, or every man be blind.

Tefeari: The Giant Impact Hypothesis is a theory

kobok

Veritas Council

Tech Team

Posts By Osmosis

\*\*\*\*\*

Posts: 4737

Karma: 145

Veritas Council

[View Profile](#)

Re: New level of skepticm

« Reply #40 on: July 11, 2006, 12:49:17 PM »

Quote from: MachineChimera on July 11, 2006, 04:53:42 AM

We are indeed going to argue over definitions here, I fear. We do not sensibly agree that there are two separate and distinct definitions of "metaphysics" and "metaphysical" in active use across the English speaking world. There is one distinct, actual, proper definition for these words in use across the English speaking world, and there is another meaning that is used in this community evidently, in a fashion outside it's actual proper meaning, to include things that are not at all metaphysical, but rather paranormal or parapsychological, if you prefer. Why you didn't simply opt for an accurate choice of descriptor, instead've a word that might otherwise seem to lend some false shroud of credibility and rational thought to the topics at hand, I cannot fathom.

Because "paranormal" includes all sorts of topics such as ghosts, and sasquatches, and little monsters swimming in British lakes, and ufos, and so forth. These topics are well outside of our common interests, and have nothing to do with the metaphysical arts.

Calling it an obscurity of this community is a significant misassessment. You need do little more investigation than googling the word "metaphysics", and noting that the first link is a wiki article which discusses the philosophy, and the second link is this article titled "Metaphysics: Multiple Meanings":

<http://www.websyte.com/alan/metamul.htm>

You'll find it essentially says exactly the same thing as what I explained to you previously, although in the author's own words.

Quote from: MachineChimera on July 11, 2006, 04:53:42 AM

Again, I will raise the point that what you are discussing here are not 'metaphysical arts', but rather paranormal, or parapsychological. I'm well familiar with both terms, though you seem to talk about it in a fashion indicative of a failing on my part in that regard.

Apparently you're not familiar, and thus why I bring it up. Parapsychology's definition, essentially wherever it is found, always begins with "The study of the evidence for..."

This is of course somewhat mandated by the "-ology" suffix. And clearly we do not have our primary focus on the study of the evidence for these arts. If we did, we would have reformatted this community into a scientific research structure long ago. That's what I do for a living, and I'm well aware of how to structure a community in that fashion. This is simply not what our primary goals are here. You are free to think what you'd like about what we should be doing with the hours in our day, but it is of course our choice regarding which area of this field we choose to focus on, the study of the evidence, or the study of the applied usage.

Quote from: MachineChimera on July 11, 2006, 04:53:42 AM

It is only not fair to expect such, when one's primary focus of study is not to verify the truth or actuality of the 'metaphysical arts', so much as to indulge in the discussion of same as though they were indeed, factual, instead've non-conclusive, unproven theories that have been around mostly in unchanged forms for centuries.

Now you're catching on. Smiley

I have a sharp, reasonable, and critical mind, and I've proven the metaphysical arts to myself multiple times through objective externally observable evidence with enough concrete veracity that there is no remaining question or concern for me regarding their truth. Thus, they ARE factual, conclusive, and proven to me, and I choose to spend my days studying the applicability of these arts, rather than to spend my days repeatedly producing evidence for others. Surely you can understand that on a personal level of principle, even if you cannot bring yourself to believe my statements.

Quote from: MachineChimera on July 11, 2006, 04:53:42 AM

So how many parapsychology journal articles did you read before forming this conclusion? An order of magnitude estimate will do... 1000? 100? 10? 1? Less than 1?"

We entirely agree upon the principle of error in forming an idea without basis upon which to form valid idea/opinion. I spoke earlier as to the error of your assumption, and the tone in which you are asserting it both previously, and again, here, and will address such now. Perhaps just over 100 texts, in estimation, as well as various pseudo-scientific articles relating to the subject(s). I'll reiterate, since you missed it before I think, that I studied the occult myself (a phase that, thankfully, I rationally woke from before become as immersed as some of the others here seem to be) for nearly 3 years. So, if you seek to insinuate that I'm criticizing something I've no factual knowledge about, you insinuate in error.[/quote]

Well, now that was a very subtle turn of phrase. I asked you how many parapsychology journal articles you have read, and you responded "over 100 texts, in estimation, as well as various pseudo-scientific articles".

You did NOT say "over 100 parapsychology journal articles". I'm sure you're well aware of the fact that articles describing how to do the occult, and other pseudoscientific



articles, are NOT the same as a published parapsychology journal article. Like I said, if we're going to talk about science and reason, we're going to get it right. Perhaps we can try again, and you can answer the question asked: How many parapsychology journal articles did you read before forming this conclusion?

Quote from: MachineChimera on July 11, 2006, 04:53:42 AM

I will start by stating that you note all of these tests discuss 'evidence' (not proof) of the above abilities,

Uh, yeah, of course. If you read pretty much any scientific paper you will see the measurements and their analysis labeled "evidence" and not "proof". This is the standard language of science, and it goes to the core definition of the scientific method. The key thing to look at is the reported "strength" of the evidence, in which case the weight of parapsychology evidence, depending on which author you read, is pretty much always described as somewhere between "compelling", "conclusive", "overwhelming", and "astronomical".

Quote from: MachineChimera on July 11, 2006, 04:53:42 AM

and that even your "fairly well-educated mathematician, statistician, and author of four statistics textbooks" along with the follow-on winner of the Nobel Prize in physics, offer only that even if such abilities as above mentioned exist, they perhaps only serve to increase the chance of knowing such things to a degree that might not even be statistically noteworthy or valid without an extended number of attempts.

Yes. That's because, as I explained to you in my previous post, THAT is what parapsychology tests. Parapsychology focuses on simple and highly controlled applications of psi such that the aspects of the experiment can be rigorously separated, the phenomena measured can be rigorously defined and quantified, and the results can be rigorously and directly analyzed with standard statistical tools. They get small consistent statistical results because the studies are designed for the express purpose of looking for small consistent statistical results. This has more scientific validity and conformity to the scientific method than a skilled participant moving an object in front of a researcher.

Quote from: MachineChimera on July 11, 2006, 04:53:42 AM

Further, you will note that is TWO supports in a community FULL of vastly more accomplished skeptics and more educated beings, as well as the overwhelming majority of other Noble Prize winners, who would disagree and do not share their findings.

Really now? Perhaps you can quote me the survey upon which you base your opinions? Or maybe you can show me how many hundreds of journal articles you have read from this "vast" community of "accomplished skeptics"?

You'll excuse me if I find this a little silly, but as I have actually read through much of the existing scientific literature, I am well aware of what you would find if you were to do so. So when you say things that clearly demonstrate to me that you have not read this

literature, and then act with an air as if you have read it, it comes across as a little ridiculous...

Quote from: MachineChimera on July 11, 2006, 04:53:42 AM

Also, I'll note that they do not open the floor to critical review and assessment of their findings and assertions by their peers in the scientific community; they only present their perception of the relevance of the findings, and in doing so actually make mention that the success rate of these so-called 'gifted' individuals is statistically very low.

Again, if you had read through the parapsychology literature, you would have a very hard time missing the many publications of Jessica Utts. Her publications in peer-reviewed scientific journals largely consist of statistical analyses, and have been highly cited as a reference in literature since the early 90s. This would be hard to miss in even a casual perusal of the field...

Quote from: MachineChimera on July 11, 2006, 04:53:42 AM

they only present their perception of the relevance of the findings, and in doing so actually make mention that the success rate of these so-called 'gifted' individuals is statistically very low.

The architects of the studies being analyzed did not set out to create huge success rates. They set out to maximize "statistical significance", not "success rates", and to do so in a way that is maximally repeatable. To maximize repeatability, it is required that you do not use special or talented participants in your study, and it is required that you conduct your study in such a way that the participants do not become fatigued. Then, for any consistent (even if weak) phenomena, statistical significance becomes a function of the amount of trials conducted by a study which continue to show this consistent phenomena. What the studies they analyze show is that psi is consistent and overwhelmingly significant (meaning, present and real with astronomical certainty) in the general untrained population.

Quote from: MachineChimera on July 11, 2006, 04:53:42 AM

Ironically, she is a credible statistician, with a credible scientific backer, that accounts for an infinitesimally small portion of a percent of community that by and large, disagrees with her entirely. Cheesy

Again, the survey you're quoting from here when you reference the scientific community as a whole? (Or perhaps, the review article which assesses the commonly published conclusion?)

Quote from: MachineChimera on July 11, 2006, 04:53:42 AM

Quote

"Now on this you and I definitely agree. But have you stopped to consider how this principle affects your own beliefs about this matter? Do you not find yourself with a philosophical predisposition which is strongly tinting the words and statements said to you by others"

I have, and was waiting for someone to take this direction. I'm pleased I didn't have to wait long. That principle affects all of us to mutual degree. The difference is that I am forming rational assertions and using the tools of logic and rational thought to pursue my viewpoint, and thereby have some modicum of buffer to natural, emotional discolorations of opinion, whereas those supporting this paranormal bunkery are not.

Ahhhh, I see. So you mean you think things that agree with your belief are "rational" and "natural", and those that disagree with your belief are not. Well doesn't that sound like good logic. :-P

Quote from: MachineChimera on July 11, 2006, 04:53:42 AM

I will demonstrate several of those courses of logic, by which, even without independent study upon the subject at hand, one might easily arrive upon the rational belief that psychic abilities and magic are fallacies. A) A thing does not directly create/induce it's opposite. We see this throughout our existence, and that opposites are generally of a negating quality, not a productive one. Wherefor, an intangible force cannot affect a physical or solid force. An intangible force or effect cannot become tangible, and neither the reverse. If you believe otherwise, please list an example that does one of the above.

Sure. Take a magnet off your fridge. Now wave your little hand behind the magnet and try to touch the magnetic flux lines. Then, put the magnet back on the fridge and stop using silly philosophical presumptions to discredit things.

"Intangible" is not a scientific concept. "Non-interacting" is a more useful one. And there are of course countless examples of things which interact only with certain other types of things, and only in certain conditions, and in other conditions are non-interacting.

Quote from: MachineChimera on July 11, 2006, 04:53:42 AM

B) If a thing exists, it exists always, unless some greater force acts in cancellation/destruction. If someone has a talent, that talent is always present. Someone that can play chess very well, can always play chess very well. It doesn't come and go with concentration or skeptic watchers. A talented basketball player is always a talented basketball player, in so far as the talent goes, outside of exterior detrimental effects like age, injury, drugs, etc. Even on an "off" day, he or she is better than the average player, and the talent even on an off day is noticeable.

Clearly you don't play chess. I do play chess fairly well, and I can assure you, my chess ability changes substantially with my mood that day, my state of health, and my mental state of focus, among other things. This may be hard to notice if you are a beginning chess player, but when you start using more of the brain to play the game, ability becomes highly modulated by human factors like this.

If we are to use a basketball analogy, consider this: Even on a bad day, a

representative basketball professional, whom we shall call "Shaq", can make baskets much better than an amateur. But now, let's give our representative Shaq a more difficult task, such as shooting baskets from half court. On a good day, Shaq can probably make an impressive number of these. On a bad day, or perhaps with people standing behind Shaq shouting that he's a fraud and not a good basketball player, I suspect our poor Shaq would make very few, if any, of those baskets from half court.

Your fallacy begins when you presume that somehow, if a talent or skill is possible, it must also be easy and require no focus. This could not be farther from the truth.

Quote from: MachineChimera on July 11, 2006, 04:53:42 AM

C) Real things that are fantastical and sensational, are generally well known. Many people know about the baby in Germany that's 'super strong' due to a strange birth defect that left him without the genes that account for the atrophy of unused muscle. World records, like the fastest running man, the strongest lifting, etc, are well documented. If such fantastical, sensational powers like the ability to lift or move objects with the mind really existed, they'd be well documented as fact, and well known. There'd be names in world record books, as to who could move the most mentally, or who's the most accurate precognitive, etc, etc.

And when the University of Chicago's National Opinion Research Center surveyed 1473 adults and asked how many had experienced ESP, 67% said that they had. It doesn't sound to me like this is wallowing in obscurity.

Personally, I'm not fond of appeals to popularity, and so I don't intend to pursue this as a line of argument. I'm just pointing out that your criticism that psi is false because it is unknown does not appear to be valid.

Quote from: MachineChimera on July 11, 2006, 04:53:42 AM

Stage magicians often induce the same reactions you describe. I suppose that makes their "magic" real, too, mm?

And Hollywood producers can make wonderful productions of moon landings. I suppose that makes those Apollo "missions" real, too, mm? Oh wait, that's right, that's a logical fallacy and has no validity. Gee...

Quote from: MachineChimera on July 11, 2006, 04:53:42 AM

You assume in ignorance that a skeptic doesn't know the nature of what he's criticizing. You assume that a skeptic forms an uneducated opinion, rather than arriving at skepticism as the rational, logical conclusion AFTER the research of the subject being belabored.

Call it a repeated pattern of observation...

Quote from: MachineChimera on July 11, 2006, 04:53:42 AM

Since you seem fond of pointing to supporting links, shall I begin giving you links for a good place to start along the rational, logical approach to reality and critical thinking, by linking the NUMEROUS, overwhelming scientific resources that debunk psychic and magical claims, or skeptical sites that would further educate you as to the mysteries of the error of thinking involved in harboring such a belief system?

Oh, please do. Smiley

Then maybe we can debate real substance rather than silly rhetoric.

Quote from: MachineChimera on July 11, 2006, 04:53:42 AM

I can only, as you have, make the assumption that you have not made a study of rational thought and logical thinking. Shall I point you in that direction as well? Grin

I think I would find such a debate most amusing, but it would probably distract significantly from our topic of discussion here.

Quote from: MachineChimera

Yes, that is the definition of a Theory: Something that can neither be proven or disproven.

\*cringe\* That's a pretty bad pop-definition of "theory", and is the type of definition that has led to stupidity like the "evolution is just a theory" campaign. Let us instead use, "A set of statements or principles devised to explain a group of facts or phenomena, especially one that has been repeatedly tested or is widely accepted and can be used to make predictions about natural phenomena." --dictionary.com

Quote from: MachineChimera

As to gravity, you have not evidently familiarized yourself with the gravitational theories of Stephen Hawkings; gravity is, to the best of present scientific theory's consideration, a PHYSICAL force...

You appear to have not familiarized yourself with the writings of a guy named MachineChimera. He did not mention "physical forces", he said "tangible", which of course means, "discernable by the touch".

Quote from: MachineChimera

Books: The Demon-Haunted World: Science as a candle in the Dark, by Carl Sagan. I am Therefore I Think: A Skeptical Manifesto, by Michael Shermer. Truth, Knowledge, Or Just Plain Bull: How To Tell The Difference: A Handbook of Practical Logic and Clear Thinking, by Bernard Patten. Skeptical Odysseys: Personal Accounts by the World's Leading Paranormal Inquirers, as edited by Paul Kurtz. Pseudoscience and the Paranormal, 2nd edition, by Terence Hines. Secrets of the Psychics: Investigating Paranormal Claims, by Massimo Polidoro. The Psychology of the Psychic, by David Marks.

Also, the following weblinks are quite handy.

<http://www.skeptic.com/>

-<http://www.randi.org/> (You'll note he offered \$10,000 initially to ANYONE that could demonstrate actual psychic, supernatural, or paranormal powers. At present, the challenge amount is in excess of \$700,000.)

<http://www.csicop.org>

<http://www.csicop.org/si/9511/eyewitness.html>

<http://www.csicop.org/si/9603/claims.html>

<http://atheism.about.com/od/skepticismnews/>

<http://www.ntskeptics.org/>

How many scientific studies have been conducted by those book authors and by these websites in total? An approximate sum would do nicely.

Logged

Salubrion

Greenhorn

A Veritas Regular

\*\*

Posts: 64

Karma: 0

Greenhorn

View Profile

Re: New level of skepticm

« Reply #41 on: July 11, 2006, 01:33:09 PM »

Well, on a happy note. This discussion has increased easily a hundred fold since moving to veritas. And MachineChimera, you have put up a very good argument, no doubt. It's interesting seeing someone who can almost keep pace with kobok.

Logged

MachineChimera

Settling In

\*

Posts: 37

Karma: 0

View Profile

Re: New level of skepticm

« Reply #42 on: July 11, 2006, 03:22:44 PM »

Quote

"Well, on a happy note. This discussion has increased easily a hundred fold since moving to veritas. And MachineChimera, you have put up a very good argument, no doubt. It's interesting seeing someone who can almost keep pace with kobok."

Rm.. glad to be of service? :d Gratitude for the credit, although I've not hardly begun to go around with Kobok. Stick around and wait for the dust to settle, neh? Wink

Logged

SethLaRoth DeShawl

Regular Member

Posts By Osmosis

\*\*\*\*\*

Posts: 581

Karma: 10

[View Profile](#)

Re: New level of skepticm

« Reply #43 on: July 11, 2006, 03:25:55 PM »

Quote from: Salubrion on July 11, 2006, 01:33:09 PM

Well, on a happy note. This discussion has increased easily a hundred fold since moving to veritas. And MachineChimera, you have put up a very good argument, no doubt. It's interesting seeing someone who can almost keep pace with kobok.

Not to mention Rare. Bet he dies popping aan artary.

\*throws a Twenty\*

Logged

MachineChimera

Settling In

\*

Posts: 37

Karma: 0

[View Profile](#)

Re: New level of skepticm

« Reply #44 on: July 11, 2006, 06:00:49 PM »

Quote

Answer the question, wise ass.

Now, we stoop to who speaks English better? Did you not agree to keep all the

sillyness out of this thread when a moderator spoke to you</rhetorical question>

Metaphysical (adj.)

2: Transcending physical matter.

Source: Oxford English Dictionary

Now, I am no scholar, but is Oxford not one of them fancy rich people schools, for learnin' and stuff?

In answer to your actual question: I would have to concede that your perception is correct, and that I practise "spookery" Since I do not adhere to your false pretence, there is no way to give you a truthful response. There is no magick/psychic forum here, so you may have to be more specific in the future. - Solstice

Gladly. I don't have a degree at present, though, honestly, I'm amused that you ask. Pray tell, what degree would qualify one to make statements about the vast body of scientific refutations of psychic claims, magick, and other paranormal spookery? I suppose a B.A. of Skepticism? Though, it's your turn to answer, since you seem to feel a degree is necessary to lend a valid opinion or understanding of a subject: What degree do you hold in regard to paranormal practices? Maybe you went to the same school Harry Potter did? Yeah. I didn't think so.

Also, nice use of the Oxford. How about you stop looking past the first, PRIMARY definition of Metaphysical, however? I'll give you some help, since you seemed to have overshot it in your scrambling haste to get to some defensible position of your former ignorance. Grin If you'll turn your eyes -just- a half inch below the following periods...

Metaphysics

- plural noun usu. treated as sing. 1 philosophy concerned with abstract concepts such as the nature of existence or of truth and knowledge.

I hope that cleared some stuff up for you. It's a rare chance I get to correct someone as to the meaning of a the same word Twice, much less in the same thread.

Now, if you'll excuse me, I've some things to address with Kobok.

Quote

"Because "paranormal" includes all sorts of topics such as ghosts, and sasquatches, and little monsters swimming in British lakes, and ufos, and so forth. These topics are well outside of our common interests, and have nothing to do with the metaphysical arts.

Calling it an obscurity of this community is a significant misassessment. You need do little more investigation than googling the word "metaphysics", and noting that the first link is a wiki article which discusses the philosophy, and the second link is this article titled "Metaphysics: Multiple Meanings":



<http://www.websyte.com/alan/metamul.htm>

You'll find it essentially says exactly the same thing as what I explained to you previously, although in the author's own words."

The qualm lies not with the slangish bastardization of the word's meaning to be inclusive of such fantasy things that are not at all concerned with the seeking of truths about the universe by rational means, since they use no rational means in their advancement in such places as this, but with your bumbling attempt at "explanation", then: had you actually used the writer's words in the first place, it would have been evident that such a meaning exists outside've a poll spontaneously taken in this community to use such a term. I, being not an actual crystal waving, sigil tracing, power word invoking Student of the Arkana am familiar only with the proper, original, ACADEMIC meaning of the term, having not read that particular book out of 1967, and not hanging around in such spookery circles. You'll stave off such misunderstandings in the future if you actually make concise reference to your source in the defense of your usage of a term. Notwithstanding that the subjects you are discussing are equally as close to metaphysics as ufo's, the big foot, Loch Ness Monster, and ghosts, among other things. And have as much proof as to your own claims' validities as the other stories can produce. Wee.

Also, I might well have stumbled across that article as the second link in google, if I'd had to google it. Some of us have, again, had formal studies, and do not need to Google to understand words. I've known the meaning of Metaphysics for some time, and actually turned to verify it with the American Heritage. We see again, however, the means in which you regularly handle things you don't understand, as it appears the foremost thought in your mind for the way to find information is to google it. An odd choice of research, for someone that attempted to lecture last post about the need to do some formal study before forming an opinion about something... or does Google count as research credible toward a magnitude of 10, these days?

Quote

"Apparently you're not familiar, and thus why I bring it up. Parapsychology's definition, essentially wherever it is found, always begins with "The study of the evidence for..." This is of course somewhat mandated by the "-ology" suffix. And clearly we do not have our primary focus on the study of the evidence for these arts. If we did, we would have reformatted this community into a scientific research structure long ago. That's what I do for a living, and I'm well aware of how to structure a community in that fashion. This is simply not what our primary goals are here. You are free to think what you'd like about what we should be doing with the hours in our day, but it is of course our choice regarding which area of this field we choose to focus on, the study of the evidence, or the study of the applied usage."

Awwr.. and I thought you'd be familiar with the original meaning of parapsychology, since you were aware of same for Metaphysics. Or maybe you just looked the latter up

etymologically? Evidently, if you Dictionary.com it, it lists such primarily. Dictionary.com however is not the all inclusive source for definitions, though even it were, the very same search lists a little further, in the American Heritage Stedman's Dictionary, "The study of extrasensory perception, such as telepathy, psychokinesis, and clairvoyance." Which is, as I'm sure you are aware, since you claim to be in the business of scientific research for such things, closer to the etymological truth of the word's intended, first use and meaning, as originally used by psychologist Max Dessoir around 1889, in response to the article "The Prophet." Then again, you do not use the term Metaphysics as it was initially created and intended, here, so why would you do likewise for Parapsychological? Silly me. Also silly me, for thinking it ridiculous to attempt discussion of the "practical applications" of supposed forces that cannot even be proven to exist. Sort've jumping the gun on that one, aren't you? It's like you went all out on the nursery, and the baby isn't even due yet.

Quote

"Now you're catching on.

I have a sharp, reasonable, and critical mind, and I've proven the metaphysical arts to myself multiple times through objective externally observable evidence with enough concrete veracity that there is no remaining question or concern for me regarding their truth. Thus, they ARE factual, conclusive, and proven to me, and I choose to spend my days studying the applicability of these arts, rather than to spend my days repeatedly producing evidence for others. Surely you can understand that on a personal level of principle, even if you cannot bring yourself to believe my statements."

\*Gasp\* All that, and so modest to boot! I'd congratulate you, but I hate to follow good news with bad; you aren't the only boyo on the block with a nimble brain, and you've gone and spoiled your claims of both reasonability -and- being critically minded when you chased it with a statement of self-validation. Sure you've proven it to yourself. You must be one hell of a scientific investigator, if that's even true, if you account the claimaint in question as being a valid source of verification. FYI, though, I'm not catching on. I'm waiting for you to catch UP. Tsk.

Quote

"Well, now that was a very subtle turn of phrase. I asked you how many parapsychology journal articles you have read, and you responded "over 100 texts, in estimation, as well as various pseudo-scientific articles".

You did NOT say "over 100 parapsychology journal articles". I'm sure you're well aware of the fact that articles describing how to do the occult, and other pseudoscientific articles, are NOT the same as a published parapsychology journal article. Like I said, if we're going to talk about science and reason, we're going to get it right. Perhaps we can try again, and you can answer the question asked: How many parapsychology journal articles did you read before forming this conclusion?"

Mm, indeed, there IS a large difference between texts and parapsychological journal

articles: I was giving you the benefit of the doubt in assuming you meant by the question to ask how many valid sources for parapsychological studies had I read, and simply bungled the proper choice of words, as again, that is the modus operandi here thusfar, it seems. I've read probably between 25 and 35 journal articles, at best guess. The mainstay of my reading has been actual BOOKS, not journals. Compilations, treatise, histories, accountings of paranormal and ESP testing and organizations, the results of such, etc. I guess that's what I get for giving you the benefit of the doubt. Somebody should promptly contact the literate community at large however, and notify them post haste that books are no longer the avant garde of reliable non-electronic information storage, and that they should transition to periodicals and journals.

#### Quote

"Uh, yeah, of course. If you read pretty much any scientific paper you will see the measurements and their analysis labeled "evidence" and not "proof". This is the standard language of science, and it goes to the core definition of the scientific method. The key thing to look at is the reported "strength" of the evidence, in which case the weight of parapsychology evidence, depending on which author you read, is pretty much always described as somewhere between "compelling", "conclusive", "overwhelming", and "astronomical".

Sure you will, when it doesn't lead to conclusive affirmation of the existence or behavior of the subject of study. Usually, when something is thusly, conclusively validated and "proven", they use such terms as "Proof" and "proven". It's after such an assertion in the scientific community that follows a description of the evidences supporting their claim of proof. You probably aren't familiar with that however, as, since you seem to be claiming you're a scientist in a parapsychological organization, and thusly haven't studied anything that has led to being conclusively proven for quite some time. I'll let it go, this time, circumstances warranting. Honestly though, you should keep up with the procedures and usages of the word Proof in scientific publications, if you're going to argue it's validity or occurrence in said publications to laity. Also, you seem to be supremely out of contact with the scientific community as a whole, as I've not seen a single scientific publication of any seriousness or repute, using such terms as 'compelling', 'conclusive', 'overwhelming', or 'astronomical', when talking about the paranormal. In fact, it's rare at best to see such a subject even broached in such weighty papers, primarily because it's not taken seriously by the scientific body as a whole, much like Bigfoot, Loch Ness, Alien abductions, or ghosts. Then again, considering your claimed profession, I suppose you can't be entirely blamed for not knowing that, either, as there's no telling what matter of journals and periodicals -you- regularly read. Or have I missed a Nobel Prize consideration going out to a paranormal researcher, what with all this "compelling, conclusive, overwhelming" evidence supporting the existence of psychic hooplah and magick? I mean, heck, what with other nominations going out for theoretical discoveries, I'm SURE they'd at least give a look to somebody that could overwhelmingly, compellingly, conclusively provide support of such a claim as people being able to move things about with their minds, or know the future. How strange.

#### Quote

"Yes. That's because, as I explained to you in my previous post, THAT is what parapsychology tests. Parapsychology focuses on simple and highly controlled applications of psi such that the aspects of the experiment can be rigorously separated, the phenomena measured can be rigorously defined and quantified, and the results can be rigorously and directly analyzed with standard statistical tools. They get small consistent statistical results because the studies are designed for the express purpose of looking for small consistent statistical results. This has more scientific validity and conformity to the scientific method than a skilled participant moving an object in front of a researcher."

That's one interesting way to look at it. Another might be, that they are only using statistical proof for things involving statistics, primarily relating to things that could fall within the realm of guesswork, and the calculation of odds of a successful guess. That is, they are testing only psychic phenomena statistically that involves potential guess-work, like "blind" cognitive tests, OOB reporting of distant, supposedly unknown locations, etc. Rather shockingly (.sarcasm.), psychic phenomena that aren't based upon statistics aren't recorded with any degree of success at all. As in "Can he move this can 10 feet away from him, on the other side of a glass panel?" That's because the success rate would be 0 out of .. infinity. Similarly for people who can 'create fire', or any physically manifested force. Most "ESP" phenomena in fact, are precognitive and clairvoyant in nature, because that's the only realm of psychic or 'magickal' claims that are actually tested with any degree of validation to submit as 'evidence' are things that people can get lucky at in guesswork. It's always "which symbol, out of 8 possible, is on this card", and partial successes are included for such things as a regular deck of cards. "Oh, he got the suit right, but not the face value. That's got to mean something." You'll note that none of these conclusive tests involve specific, intricate information for an OOB, or a cognitive. Reading someone's mind doesn't ever produce "He's holding a letter that has 10 words on it. The 10 words are "I do not believe this crap is actually being tested." How strange; evidently your otherworldly uber1337 hacx0r powerz only allow vague successes. Again, a pattern is forming! \*shock!\*

#### Quote

"Really now? Perhaps you can quote me the survey upon which you base your opinions? Or maybe you can show me how many hundreds of journal articles you have read from this "vast" community of "accomplished skeptics"?"

You'll excuse me if I find this a little silly, but as I have actually read through much of the existing scientific literature, I am well aware of what you would find if you were to do so. So when you say things that clearly demonstrate to me that you have not read this literature, and then act with an air as if you have read it, it comes across as a little ridiculous..."

What is ridiculous, is your feigned demeanor of actual knowledge on the subject, when you assert claims that are ridiculous. I'm not sure what you consider 'scientific literature', but I consider it to be materials produced by people with actual degrees, and

the opinions of people with said degrees in the pertaining fields of study. There is a reason why "Parapsychology" is considered a joke by most serious scientists, and why scientific conventions and award communities aren't ever giving up mentions or praise for that manner of thing. They are discussing quantum mechanics, physics, molecular biology, and so on for the advancements. Note that valid sources of study are taught in schools as coursework and curriculum. Note also that parapsychological claims like yours do not exist in classrooms, outside of the study of such claims/search for evidence; there are no accredited schools offering coursework in psionics disciplines, magical spellcraft, etc. Why is that? You don't seem to get it. Maybe this will help clear your head: Susan Blackmore ring a bell? A DOCTOR of parapsychology, who has, in her entire career, found NO evidence or reproducible success of any psi phenomena. "For instance, she wrote in 1996: "When I decided to become a parapsychologist I had no idea it would mean 20 years of failing to find the paranormal." Blackmore has made a career for herself as one of the world's most well known skeptics of psi, and in 1988 was elected a Fellow of CSICOP." She's hardly alone. Perhaps you should check out the CSICOP site for yourself, since you seem to be dwelling in a fantasy land where actual scientists accept psionics as a valid, existant force, or concept worthy of study. I'll also point out that a myriad number of healthy minds go into such fields as quantum mechanics and theoretical physics specifically to seek out the answers to the mysterious forces in the universe. Compare the number of such healthy, brilliant minds to the number of people pursuing parapsychology degrees. I don't think we even need to look up the actual numbers coming out in the respective degrees, or compare the number of truly brilliant, gifted minds that have gone into the former fields, and the number of same that have chosen the latter. You might wonder as to why these things are, but it's pretty plain to anyone of a rational bent, why that is. Let me help you out in that regard as well. "The Observer newspaper published at the time, David Deutsch, a quantum physicist at Oxford University, described Josephson's claim as "utter rubbish" and went on to say there is no evidence that paranormal phenomena actually exist. Asked by Physics World whether the paranormal might become a respectable area of research, Deutsch was still highly dismissive "One day Santa Claus might turn out to be a respectable area of research. All one can say is that there is no better evidence for the one than for the other." ""Physicists have an emotional response when they hear anything connected with parapsychology," he says. "Their opinion of parapsychology research is not based on evaluation of the evidence but on a dogmatic belief that all research in this field is false." From PhysicsWeb.org, the following. "Most readers of Physics World will probably dismiss paranormal phenomena as either utter nonsense or not worthy of serious study." Since you aren't familiar with such Journals, it seems, I'll help you out further: do try to find a single article that HAS made it into an actual periodical or publishment within the scientific community, which you purport to be a part of, that wasn't attacked outright by not merely a large volume of readers, but by the MAJORITY of them. Kthnx. And get a picture of the Unicorn when you do. Wink

#### Quote

"Again, if you had read through the parapsychology literature, you would have a very hard time missing the many publications of Jessica Utts. Her publications in

peer-reviewed scientific journals largely consist of statistical analyses, and have been highly cited as a reference in literature since the early 90s. This would be hard to miss in even a casual perusal of the field..."

I'll direct you to read not merely Jessica Utt's publications, but the even HARDER to miss rebuttals and skeptical counteranalyses made by her opponents. Conveniently, you make no mention of these, and seem to imply that Jessica Utts, merely by stating (However weakly her claims did, at all, support ESP testings she did analysis of, by pretty much asserting it wasn't a perfect ability so much as a slightly higher ability to get a statistically superior number of the test criterion passes, if one drew out the testing long enough. Again, she also stated in the same article that was linked that the abilities of psychics tested are pretty much inconsequential and unnoteworthy, unless one drew out tests over a longer period of time. AND once again, in tests relating to guess work, miraculously, not 100% do or do not physically manifestable psychic claims, or specific test criteria that cannot be guessed at with any accuracy.) her backing of the results as evidence of ESP activity, has made it so. Try reviewing the detractions made by the reviewers and respondents in the scientific community to said publications.

#### Quote

"The architects of the studies being analyzed did not set out to create huge success rates. They set out to maximize "statistical significance", not "success rates", and to do so in a way that is maximally repeatable. To maximize repeatability, it is required that you do not use special or talented participants in your study, and it is required that you conduct your study in such a way that the participants do not become fatigued. Then, for any consistent (even if weak) phenomena, statistical significance becomes a function of the amount of trials conducted by a study which continue to show this consistent phenomena. What the studies they analyze show is that psi is consistent and overwhelmingly significant (meaning, present and real with astronomical certainty) in the general untrained population."

Of course they didn't. They'd fail 100% percent of the time. Which is why they structure the tests the way they do: the only way that they can get results that can even be argued to be significant evidence of the claims being purported. Any studies being analyzed for an actual, Huge success rate, which would be in following with.. something that actually is factual, like a working mathematical formula, a new invention's actual ability to do what it's claimed to do, or a new discovery that can actually be displayed. Again, this is not what ESP is all about, because ESP isn't real. If it were real, such Huge successes could be demonstrated: You can't really argue statistically or otherwise, someone moving a cup through a glass panel, 10' away, with their mind. You can conclusively prove that no outside forces were acting to cause the movement, and attribute the movement to the claim itself. Especially if such power actually existed, because it could be repeated. A telekinetic is always a telekinetic, if such a thing actually was. The power wouldn't just leave them the moment it's used. Or is this the part where the usual lame excuses come in, about "Your skeptic energy disrupted by focus" or "I can't concentrate today." Wah-wah-waaaaaaaah. The only

thing "Consistant" about these studies is their vagueness (Again, test subjects are never asked to describe a symbol on a card that's unique in a deck of say, 2,000 options, or to describe the contents of a 10 word sentence. It's always a number or a symbol, usually one they've already seen, as in they're shown the options in the deck or cards, and one that has a pretty rational chance of being guessed at blindly in occurrence, however marginalized that chance is.), and the fact that they're always inconclusive, and at best "might indicate" "something" out of the average is occurring. If, as Jessica Utts pointed out nicely, the test results are considered in a broad enough range.

Quote

"Again, the survey you're quoting from here when you reference the scientific community as a whole? (Or perhaps, the review article which assesses the commonly published conclusion?)"

See above for instances of actually weighty, regularly published scientific journal(s), and the opinions generally held by the scientific community of readers.

Quote

"

Ahhhh, I see. So you mean you think things that agree with your belief are "rational" and "natural", and those that disagree with your belief are not. Well doesn't that sound like good logic. :-P"

Rather, I think that things that derive from rational arrival or deduction are "rational", and those that are not arrived upon by rational means, but by irrational ones, are not. It is rational to have solid evidence of a thing's existence before attempting or 'practicing' it. One does not practice the martial arts before learning that at least once does in fact, exist. If you just decide that something you've heard debated about actually exists, and begin trying to do it in your own home, you cannot just imagine you have seen successful results of your 'practice' and claim it to be of that martial art, when there's no actual record of the art's existence. You're just flailing around in your home, pretending to be doing something you Think could be out there. That's what is called NON-rational, or irrational. Cheesy

Quote

"Sure. Take a magnet off your fridge. Now wave your little hand behind the magnet and try to touch the magnetic flux lines. Then, put the magnet back on the fridge and stop using silly philosophical presumptions to discredit things.

"Intangible" is not a scientific concept. "Non-interacting" is a more useful one. And there are of course countless examples of things which interact only with certain other types of things, and only in certain conditions, and in other conditions are non-interacting."

I'm not sure you understand the meaning of touch. If I waved my hand through the

magnetic flux lines, my skin/hand actually did touch, and pass through, the flux lines. Touch occurred. Intangibility, likewise, is not a scientific concept. Intangibility is a word based upon scientific concept: the concept of physicality, and physical properties. Please do however, provide one of these 'countless examples' of a non-physically acting force that affects the physical world, or vice versa. That is, a force that does not operate physically, and does not have a physical source. Then, if you manage that (aha. Aha.), provide a demonstration of how such a force has been demonstrated to be capable of affecting a physical thing, i.e. something with physical properties. Again, Aha, aha. Hopefully I won't have to wait long, since you claim there are "countless" examples of such, yet strangely mentioned none. Hm.

Actually, I was taught to play Chess by Grandmaster Parham himself, using the Parham method that he specifically created. I'll forgive you yet another ignorant assumption, however, as I'm not fond of breaking a man's streak. Smiley I'll also forgive you your attempted condescending, yet again, since you have to have SOMETHING to make you feel good about yourself, and it clearly isn't what's coming out of that self-allegedly 'sharp, critical' brain of yours. I'll break it down for you, as your ability to glean meaning from text is also apparently suspect: I already specified that, while someone with talent may fluctuate in the ability they demonstrate due to environmental variables, the talent itself, regardless of it's degree of expression, is always present, and noticable to anyone that has talent themselves. No matter how 'off' you are emotionally, you are never going to come off as unskilled, if you are skilled, without intentional deception and attempt to hide your talent. Once you start playing chess for a while, you'll learn to pick up on certain things, like a person's emotional state, state of distraction, the measuring of their time per play versus their usual (once you start playing in tournaments, you'll get to watch regular players doing their thing, and maybe take note of how fast they usually run their game), and other such subtleties. You'll never mistake someone like Bobby Fischer for untalented, no matter HOW bad a day he's having, or his emotional mindset. I can only surmise that you've.. never actually seen true talent, if you haven't witnesses this to be the case? Michael Jordan, no matter how bad a day he was having, would never get schooled by the average basketball player, as another example. In fact, even ON His off nights, of which commentaries are made, if you happen to watch sports with any frequency involving top notch athletes, they are still successful. They are only below their curve and "having a bad night" in contrast to their usual phenomenal output. Your example is an addressment not of a disappearance of talent, which you in support of my own assertion (which you are at present attempting to ridicule? Choose a side, eh?) stated would still be apparent against an amateur, is an example of degree, not disappearance. I addressed that already, as well, by stating specifically that a person with talent may perform badly for his talent, but that talent is still evident. Again, when someone with a real Talent 'has a bad night', it is only in contrast to their usual capabilities.

Also, you yet again presume in error that I somewhere made the statement that talent is expressed without concentration or effort. Do, please, use your Sharp, Critical mind and scientific research abilities to find in my post where I indicated such, even subtly? Get back to me when you find that. It's probably buried with Jimmy Hoffa, who by



chance will be holding the rifle that was used on the grassy knoll. I asserted only that a talent is repeatable, when it is possessed.. it doesn't appear one night, and disappear the next. If you can move something with your mind, you can move something with your mind. The degree of application may fluctuate, but it does not altogether fail. A powerlifter never walks into a gym, maxing out at 450 lbs, and abruptly, because his 'concentration' isn't there and he's sore and lacking energy, fail to push 300 for example. Regardless of how into it he is, the talent actually exists, in that he has the muscle mass to do it. His motivation and energy levels are the single variables in the matter. If a person can move a soda can with their mind (Yay, useful talent, btw! If it existed, I'd seriously be so tauntful of it.), they can always move things with their mind, and it will only fluctuate in terms of how much, or for how long. If they can't push 10 ounces that night, they should at least be able to influence 5, or 1 ounce. But don't. A talent is, I dare say, never of the nature of "I can sometimes do it, sometimes not." It's merely a matter of degree in display/usage.

#### Quote

"And when the University of Chicago's National Opinion Research Center surveyed 1473 adults and asked how many had experienced ESP, 67% said that they had. It doesn't sound to me like this is wallowing in obscurity.

Personally, I'm not fond of appeals to popularity, and so I don't intend to pursue this as a line of argument. I'm just pointing out that your criticism that psi is false because it is unknown does not appear to be valid."

Again, your ability to entirely miss what is actually being said in the words you are supposedly reading, astounds me. I said that no documented claims of success were known, not that uneducated individuals at large did not hold a popular belief in fallacies, or know what the concepts discussed actually mean. How many people could be polled to know if Dragons exist, or elves? I bet they'd know what you meant about dragons and elves, respectively. Their knowledge of these terms CLEARLY has some relevance to the actual existance of these creatures, by your reasoning? w00t!! And, alternately, here's an insight that MAY serve you well in your "parapsychological research", if you actually do that for a living; people lie on polls. When polled as to the frequency of sex, numbers are generally trumped. The same is true for any number of other poll issues. You could poll any number of Americans to see how many actually follow luck based superstitions, like carrying rabbits feet, wearing a lucky article of clothing or color before a test, a special gym sock before a big game, carry a lucky coin on them, and so on. I suppose that indicates they all believe that their stinky sock actually affects how every other player in the game performs, if you asked them that question outright, or that a sliced off piece of rodent corpse is physically connected to some force that controls the functions of probability, or that color will somehow interact meaningfully with their brain's ability to recall information they should have paid attention to in class for the previous semester? So yes, way to use popular poll (which is itself, a WELL respected and renowned resource for evidence, it might be added. Way to lower the bar!!) as support for something that is generally supported only by anecdotal success stories. It's a refreshing change from the norm, at least.

Quote

"And Hollywood producers can make wonderful productions of moon landings. I suppose that makes those Apollo "missions" real, too, mm? Oh wait, that's right, that's a logical fallacy and has no validity. Gee..."

I'm not familiar with Hollywood, not being of a religious bend, but if you mean Hollywood, I'm hardly shocked that someone that's supporting crystal waving, sigil drawing chanting and invocations buys into conspiracy theory. Yes, the American government was able to involve literally thousands of government employees in a super-secret fraud involving billions of dollars that somehow weren't accounted for in the budgeting analysis of non-local department resources, and none of THOSE thousands of employees let slip this classified information to any of THEIR family members, etc, etc, etc. Thankfully, sharp, Critical minds like yourselves were able to so easily slice through the veil of mystery they'd woven with practiced information control policies and far, far more extensive financial and training resources than yourself. You really do think a lot of yourself, don't you. Quite frankly, if the government wanted to dupe you about something, you'd be pretty much up the proverbial creek, since they can afford to hire in Top Notch experts to review and assure that any hoax they did want to pull off would go seamlessly, and be impervious to the common scrutiny.

Quote

"Oh wait, that's a logical fallacy and has no validity. Gee..."

Thank you Kobok. I couldn't have put it better myself! Grin

Quote

"Quote from: MachineChimera on Today at 04:53:42 AM

You assume in ignorance that a skeptic doesn't know the nature of what he's criticizing. You assume that a skeptic forms an uneducated opinion, rather than arriving at skepticism as the rational, logical conclusion AFTER the research of the subject being belabored."

Kobot - "Call it a repeated pattern of observation..."

I'll call it what I've been calling it all along; assumptive ignorance. Sharp and Critical mind, indeed.

Quote

"Oh, please do.

Then maybe we can debate real substance rather than silly rhetoric."

A debate of real substance? You're not at all interested in such a thing, you intellectual Tease, you. All you've provided thusfar were word-definition arguments and weak attempts at refutation in technical debate fashion of the attacks I'm asserting upon the matter of debate. You're providing no resources that, from the start, were asked for: scientifically backed proof, or even strong evidence of something that should, if real, be quite EASY to demonstrate and verify. It's hard to get confused by the demonstration

of fire being spontaneously produced, or an object being decisively moved several feet away without being touched, or a specific set of information being related that couldn't possibly be guessed at. Yet none of these things are forthcoming. Again, no surprise. That's how it's been for doctorates and degree-bearing parapsychologists since the inception of the field. You're basically professing to believing in something that hasn't been proven or conclusively demonstrated even by the greatest minds to come to the field from the point of it's creation to present. That's probably the most irrational part of the entire discourse... which is saying something, considering some of the claims you've made.

By the by.. you never DID mention where this 'publicity' you supposedly received for your 'been there, done that' demonstrations of your 1337 powerz came from? TELevised? Published? Or did you mean by 'publicity' that some people you demonstrated before were amazed by your little magic trick, and talked about it, since they didn't know how you pulled it off, or how to distinguish between actual demonstration and elements not at all related to what you were purporting to do? Jesus Christ, man. At least the professional charlatans like David Blain and Criss Angel perform their faux-supernatural tricks in front of a television camera and news crews. You really need to step up your game.

Quote

"\*cringe\* That's a pretty bad pop-definition of "theory", and is the type of definition that has led to stupidity like the "evolution is just a theory" campaign. Let us instead use, "A set of statements or principles devised to explain a group of facts or phenomena, especially one that has been repeatedly tested or is widely accepted and can be used to make predictions about natural phenomena."

If by "pretty bad pop-definition" of "theory" you mean "concise, extremely simplified version", then yes. You can use whichever you like, but both are equally true and applicable, unless you will make the claim that a Theory in fact can be proven or disproven? If that's the case, then by all means, refute, and I'll notify the pertinent defining authorities. If it's not the case, and you agree that such does apply perfectly to a Theory, then you're just... wasting text as filler in name-calling the simplified version. Whatever you've got to do to feel better about yourself, man. Wink

Quote

"You appear to have not familiarized yourself with the writings of a guy named MachineChimera. He did not mention "physical forces", he said "tangible", which of course means, "discernable by the touch".

You appear not to be familiar with the meaning of "touch", which is to cause or permit a part of the body to come into contact with. Something that is physical, like the body, cannot come into contact with, or "touch" something that is not physical/has no physical qualities.

Quote

"How many scientific studies have been conducted by those book authors and by these websites in total? An approximate sum would do nicely."

Hundreds, between the authors provided, and the website links, a large number of them specifically detailed in the texts. Several of the writers hold degrees in psychology or parapsychology, as well. Now then, I'd like the same information for the links I was provided? Also, how about some specifically detailed information about the nature of those 'statistically' successful trials Jessica Utts reports, and how the tests were conducted? Or are we to blindly accept that she tested reliably, in credible fashion, without knowing exactly the nature of the tests she ran. Allow me to blindly guess (don't confuse my success with psychic powah! I assure you, such is not the case.) what her tests involved: Random number generators, within a known set, "telepathic" testing with a person holding a card facing toward them, concentrating on the symbol, picture, or number on the card, while the person across from them attempts to "discern" what exactly is being projected to them/for them? Wow. AMAZING!

« Last Edit: July 11, 2006, 06:23:50 PM by MachineChimera »      Logged

Pages: 1 2 [3] 4 5 ... 9      Print

« previous next »

Jump to:

=> Main Hall

Powered by MySQL Powered by PHP    Powered by SMF 1.1.18 | SMF © 2013, Simple Machines

Oxygen design by Bloc    Valid XHTML 1.0! Valid CSS!

<http://forums.vsociety.net/index.php/topic%2C8667.60.html>

1 capture

29 Apr 2013

Mar    APR    May

29

2012    2013    2014

About this capture

The Veritas Society

\*

\*HomeForumsChatHelpSearchRetroLoginRegister

Welcome, Guest. Please login or register.

Did you miss your activation email?

April 29, 2013, 04:41:21 PM

Forever

Login with username, password and session length

Search:

Advanced search

207331 Posts in 14732 Topics by 18409 Members - Latest Member: - nest4sudan  
Most online today: 99 - most online ever: 430 (June 28, 2007, 02:58:51 PM)

+ The Veritas Society

|-+ The Auditorium

||-+ Main Hall

|||-+ New level of skepticism 0 Members and 2 Guests are viewing this topic.

« previous next »

Pages: 1 ... 3 4 [5] 6 7 ... 9 Print

Author Topic: New level of skepticism (Read 15060 times)

MachineChimera

Settling In

\*

Posts: 37

Karma: 0

[View Profile](#)

Re: New level of skepticism

« Reply #60 on: July 13, 2006, 03:14:01 PM »

Quote

"My ignorance?! HAHA. I guess I am going to have to repeat myself, since you did/can not read..."

METAPHYSICAL (ADJ)

2: Transcending physical matter.

Source: OXFORD ENGLISH DICTIONARY

As for the privacy thing, I was meaning that people do not need to know about your interests in bondage. Speaking of which, in your forum post (you know where), you are wondering why people think you come off as aggressive, and that you have "never insulted anyone to [your] knowledge." Think again. Calling people "candylanders" (among other) things is an insult to those of us who are not socially inept.

While we are discussing your INTERESTS, let's also look at something else:

Taoism

With your massive intellect, I am sure even you can see how this brings into question your intentions with this forum. You have tao listed as one of your areas of interests on your Dilly profile. You do know that one of the tao philosophies includes ALCHEMY and DIVINATION."

Yes, your ignorance. This is the second time we've gone through just THIS exact

transaction. Evidently, you don't read, or forget what you read soon thereafter. I'll reiterate, for your probable non-benefit. That's the SECOND definition in the oxford English. What's the FIRST definition, braniac?

"metaphysical

- adjective 1 relating to metaphysics."

And the OXFORD definition of Metaphysics?

"metaphysics

- plural noun usu. treated as sing. 1 philosophy concerned with abstract concepts such as the nature of existence or of truth and knowledge."

I guess you didn't make it that far, huh? Awwr. Good try though!

As to my "private" life, again, if I was afraid or ashamed of my personal tastes and interests, I wouldn't be using the same name, and wouldn't have it be publically accessible information on the internet. Grin In that particular thread, I was pointing out that it seemed the lot of them were ganging up on me. I've since moved on to not caring, as the response tends to be much the same, the world over, whenever a new person shows up to rattle the cage: all the well-known regulars group together. Most people instinctively seek to protect what they're familiar with and know, rather than side with something new and unproven.

I for one aren't ashamed of my personal life, irregardless of this particular subject. I notice however that you aren't as forthcoming, and don't have any pictures up. There's probably a reason for that, huh? Grin Poor guy.  
And yes, an interest in Taoism, does not mean I am a follower/believer. I'm also aware that most restaurants have meat in them. Being vegetarian, I tend to stay away from that sort've thing. The point being, you can enjoy something, without partaking of EVERYTHING that falls under it's umbrella.

Not surprisingly, that seemed to fly over your head too. Keep trying, though. One of these days, the ideas might start settling into place.

Logged  
solstice  
Dreamwalker  
Posts By Osmosis  
\*\*\*\*\*

Posts: 2114  
Karma: -6

"Receive and transmit..."

[View Profile](#)

Re: New level of skepticm

« Reply #61 on: July 13, 2006, 03:19:14 PM »

\*smacks forehead\* Was it not also explained to you, that when "metaphysical arts" is the context, then the second definition applies?  
(meta = beyond; physical...) The order in which the listings appear is irrelevant, since the literal translation of the word is exactly how I paraphrased.

Logged

Tell all the Truth but tell it slant: Success in Circuit lies. Too bright for our infirm Delight. The Truth's superb surprise. As Lightning to the Children eased, with explanation kind. The Truth must dazzle gradually, or every man be blind.

Tefeari: The Giant Impact Hypothesis is a theory  
freefallingdot

A Veritas Regular

\*\*

Posts: 98

Karma: 0

The Knight of Swords

[View Profile](#)

Re: New level of skepticm

« Reply #62 on: July 13, 2006, 03:29:57 PM »

I believe they explained to you several times that there are more than one definitions of the word. What order they appear in the dictionary is of no debatable value. If you feel an irrepresable need to bring irrelevant information to the table, it begs the question of why you started the debate in the first place. If it is merely to rant on about definitions and their order in the \*edited\* dictionary, do not expect people to take you seriously. In the case of the articles you read, would you mind PM ing me some of the information you read in them, and some of the links you used.

Also, if you question the existence of the occult, yet won't agree on definitions of words, how in the hell do you expect for your mind to be changed?

Just giving my piece of the pie,

FFD

Logged

Boldly, I bow to the banished, bend knee to the broken, and break bread with the bereaved. Behold the breath-taking beauty of brutality, of quick and permanent change, breaking the lines built to separate polarities. Brashly blending that which can't be bent.

Zake

Veritas Staff

Veritas Moderator

Posts By Osmosis

\*\*\*\*\*

Posts: 1722

Karma: 0

Veritas Staff

[View Profile](#)

Re: New level of skepticism

« Reply #63 on: July 13, 2006, 03:39:16 PM »

I'm actually going to have to side with machinechimera on this particular issue, solstice. If you took a mention of "metaphysics" from somewhere outside Veritas, it is most likely referring to the regular old mundane branch of philosophy, and has nothing to do with what we do around here. You can't force him to have been using the second definition when he meant the first. I highly endorse the notion that this entire side-discussion about the word "metaphysics" be dropped, simply because it's so stupid and distracting from an otherwise interesting discussion.

Logged

Act; for the universe will never forget your movement, nor will it ever forgive your stillness.

solstice

Dreamwalker

Posts By Osmosis

\*\*\*\*\*

Posts: 2114

Karma: -6

"Receive and transmit..."



[View Profile](#)

Re: New level of skepticism

« Reply #64 on: July 13, 2006, 03:49:43 PM »

In that case, it was not which definition, but WHO knew what it meant. The original argument was that "spookery" and metaphysical arts were fake -- so, unless our beefy friend is a liar and a hypocrite, then he was in fact referring to the second definition, by implication.

Logged

Tell all the Truth but tell it slant: Success in Circuit lies. Too bright for our infirm Delight. The Truth's superb surprise. As Lightning to the Children eased, with explanation kind. The Truth must dazzle gradually, or every man be blind.

Tefeari: The Giant Impact Hypothesis is a theory

MachineChimera

Settling In

\*

Posts: 37

Karma: 0

[View Profile](#)

Re: New level of skepticism

« Reply #65 on: July 13, 2006, 03:54:50 PM »

Quote

"\*smacks forehead\* Was it not also explained to you, that when "metaphysical arts" is the context, then the second definition applies?

(meta = beyond; physical...) The order in which the listings appear is irrelevant, since the literal translation of the word is exactly how I paraphrased." -Solstice

Quote

I believe they explained to you several times that there are more than one definitions of the word. What order they appear in the dictionary is of no debatable value. If you feel an irrepressible need to bring irrelevant information to the table, it begs the question of why you started the debate in the first place. If it is merely to rant on about definitions and their order in the \*edited\* dictionary, do not expect people to take you seriously. In the case of the articles you read, would you mind PM ing me some of the information you read in them, and some of the links you used.

Also, if you question the existence of the occult, yet won't agree on definitions of words, how in the hell do you expect for your mind to be changed?

Just giving my piece of the pie,

FFD

As Zake addressed, I was not arguing that the second definition was invalid. I was disputing the implication you were attempting to cram down my throat, Solstice, that I was somehow hypocritical for having Metaphysics as an interest on one of my pages.

As to you, FFD, I'm afraid I would mind PMing you to provide the information in the links. You are free to click on them and read them for yourself, if they are of interest to you, as Kobok has done. Further, since you didn't seem to grasp the notion, I was, as Zake clearly understood, not arguing over the order of the definitions. I was citing it once more to make rebuttal to Solstice's evident nonunderstanding as to the above instance of Metaphysics as an interest of mine. In fact, the entire 'rant' of arguing about the definition of words started because Solstice, before I even engaged the debate in this particular forum, was ignorant of Metaphysics' actual pre-50's meaning, sadly enough, and thought to name me ignorant for the actual primary/original definition with which I was familiar.

And, since you evidently haven't been following the discussion thusfar, I'll clue you in: I've agreed to the use of "Metaphysical" in the regard of the so called "Metaphysical arts", once Kobok made me familiar with the term's usage in this community, originating from the late mid of the 20th century.

Quote

In that case, it was not which definition, but WHO knew what it meant. The original argument was that "spookery" and metaphysical arts were fake -- so, unless our beefy friend is a liar and a hypocrite, then he was in fact refering to the second definition, by implication. -Solstice

Yes, that metaphysical arts. Not Metaphysics. I have an expressed interest on the website you were referring to, in Metaphysics, not Metaphysical arts, and consider the "Metaphysical arts" as they're called, to be fantasy. Metaphysics itself, is a factual philosophical interest.

« Last Edit: July 13, 2006, 04:05:42 PM by MachineChimera »      Logged

solstice

Dreamwalker

Posts By Osmosis

\*\*\*\*\*

Posts: 2114

Karma: -6

"Receive and transmit..."

[View Profile](#)

Re: New level of skepticism

« Reply #66 on: July 13, 2006, 04:09:12 PM »

Metaphysical arts and "metaphysics" are the same damn thing. One is the adjective, and another is the individual disciplines that ARE metaphysical... you know, what you called candied spookery.

Psychic/psionic pursuits are NOT physical; the mechanism is a METAPHYSICAL one. If you understood what either meant, you would know this.

Logged

Tell all the Truth but tell it slant: Success in Circuit lies. Too bright for our infirm Delight. The Truth's superb surprise. As Lightning to the Children eased, with explanation kind. The Truth must dazzle gradually, or every man be blind.

Tefeari: The Giant Impact Hypothesis is a theory

MachineChimera

Settling In

\*

Posts: 37

Karma: 0

[View Profile](#)

Re: New level of skepticism

« Reply #67 on: July 13, 2006, 04:19:00 PM »

Quote

"Metaphysical arts and "metaphysics" are the same damn thing. One is the adjective, and another is the individual disciplines that ARE metaphysical... you know, what you called candied spookery.

Psychic/psionic pursuits are NOT physical; the mechanism is a METAPHYSICAL one. If you understood what either meant, you would know this."

You.. continue to astound me. It's like it goes in one ear and out the other. ;o

\*Shakes head to dispel incredulity.\*

Alright, I'll try this in smaller, slower words. Metaphysics, and Metaphysical arts, are two different subjects indeed. Metaphysics is a branch of philosophy. Metaphysical arts, is a phrase coined in the 50's, to be used as a blanket term for such things as psionic and magickal activity. If you still think they're the same thing, check the definition of Oxford again. Or try running Metaphysical Arts through Oxford and see what, if anything, comes up.

And, yeah, Psychic/psionic pursuits are not necessarily physical. Punching someone in the face is not legal, but studying Law does not mean you are studying punching someone in the face. Is that simple enough for you? Did you get that? Here's

another example of how, Just because A is true for B, does not mean B is true for A:  
Martial arts is a study involving self control. That does not mean that if you are  
studying self control, you are studying martial arts. So yes, while your claimed  
Psychic spookery is not a physical thing, and would potentially fall under the definition of  
Metaphysics, Metaphysics itself is not the study of psychic spookery, and does not  
necessarily include that. Ideas and emotions are not physical either, and Metaphysics  
is not the study of thought. That falls under Psychology's realm.

Logged  
solstice  
Dreamwalker  
Posts By Osmosis

\*\*\*\*\*

Posts: 2114  
Karma: -6

"Receive and transmit..."

[View Profile](#)

Re: New level of skepticm  
« Reply #68 on: July 13, 2006, 04:46:05 PM »  
Meta = beyond.  
Physical == Physical

Which part of that is philosophical?

Logged  
Tell all the Truth but tell it slant: Success in Circuit lies. Too bright for our infirm  
Delight. The Truth's superb surprise. As Lightning to the Children eased, with  
explanation kind. The Truth must dazzle gradually, or every man be blind.  
Tefeari: The Giant Impact Hypothesis is a theory  
MachineChimera  
Settling In  
\*

Posts: 37  
Karma: 0

[View Profile](#)

Re: New level of skepticm  
« Reply #69 on: July 13, 2006, 04:47:18 PM »

Quote

""TRANSCENDING PHYSICAL MATTER" is NOT a philosophy. What astounds me, is how you keep ignoring that, when someone brings into context your ranting on metaphysics, yet dont seem to adhere to one definition. How is it one interests you, but when the other is mentioned, you claim the person does not understand you? Remember, it was you that mentioned this topic in the first place, in your original rant at the Commite. So, dont come up in here and say something contrary. You know that you mean the second definition and you know that I do, too. Get over it."

LOL! You are just.. god. I'm glad this is actually being saved in text format for posterity's sake. I may need a good laugh now and then, and a place to point friends to. Grin

Are you stating that Metaphysics is not a philosophy, by oxford's definition? Or merely that the Secondary definition of Metaphysics isn't? If the latter, allow me to say a resounding DUH. If the former, then I don't know what you're blathering about. I didn't say that the secondary definition was a philosophy. I said Metaphysics is. Metaphysics is the philosophy I was listing as an interest on the page you looked at to see such initially. Metaphysics, does not equal Metaphysical arts. Metaphysics can be used, as an alternate definition, to refer to Metaphysical arts, but when used such, it is not being used to mean the Philosophy. The philosophy, and it's use in reference to the "spookery" of so called "Metaphysical arts", are two different definitions/things. If, after all this, you STILL do not understand, I'd recommend you get with Zake, Kobok, or somebody else of a respectable mind, and have them explain it to you in terms you can understand. I'm evidently incapable of lowering myself to the speaking language with which you discern meanings.

Quote

"Meta = beyond.  
Physical == Physical

Which part of that is philosophical?"

Oh, Good. You changed it. A shame I captured your original statement before you could alter it. Cheesy! Ahem.

Which part? How about the original creation of the word. "-al = of, or relating to. So, Metaphysical is "of, or relating to, Metaphysic". Do an etymological search for Metaphysics. Here, I'll do it for you.

"from Greek (Ta) meta (ta) phusika, (the works) after the Physics, the title of Aristotle's treatise on first principles (so called because it followed his work on physics)"

There you go. You actually -learned- something today. You learned where the word Metaphysics comes from, and why it's the term for the philosophy that it is. Grin

« Last Edit: July 13, 2006, 04:52:43 PM by MachineChimera »      Logged

solstice

Dreamwalker

Posts By Osmosis

\*\*\*\*\*

Posts: 2114

Karma: -6

"Receive and transmit..."

[View Profile](#)

Re: New level of skepticism

« Reply #70 on: July 13, 2006, 04:53:39 PM »

Dude, I deleted my post before you replied... I did some back-tracking.

Turns out that you replied to me for no real reason at all, speaking of illiterate. I said the "people" who posted originally on the other site did not know what metaphysical means. Since we know you have one definition down, yet you actually came back and accused ME of not knowing. Where is this aggression coming from? I already posted the Oxford definition twice.

Logged

Tell all the Truth but tell it slant: Success in Circuit lies. Too bright for our infirm Delight. The Truth's superb surprise. As Lightning to the Children eased, with explanation kind. The Truth must dazzle gradually, or every man be blind.

Tefeari: The Giant Impact Hypothesis is a theory

Prophecy

Theurgist

Veritas Teacher

Posts By Osmosis

\*\*\*\*\*

Posts: 1230

Karma: 62

[Veritas Teacher](#)

[View Profile](#)

Re: New level of skepticism

« Reply #71 on: July 13, 2006, 05:01:55 PM »

Well, I certainly do not have the time to read through all five pages of this post, but I must say that there is some ground to any argument to be had regarding context and

exact definition.

Metaphysics is, above all, the study of things beyond the physical. To use it in its proper term, you would be referring to philosophies such as those presented in Aristotle's "Of Metaphysics" and Immanuel Kant's "Prolegomena." The philosophy presented in such works, though I believe they hold great value to the spiritualist, in fact has little to do with the practical branch of spirituality which has here been decided to be called metaphysics. Deciding upon calling it this, though in fact metaphysical philosophy does not involve many aspects of the arts practiced here, is not entirely fallacious however. Much of the spiritual practices here, which are often called "metaphysics," in fact all share very common grounds in the theoretical science of Metaphysical Philosophy, usually using the theories proposed by the great metaphysical philosophers to establish the theories of practical spirituality. For example, then, metaphysics argues (most of the time) favourably regarding the existence of a soul, and it is likewise argued by some metaphysicists, such as the Hebrew scholars and Christian theologians, that this soul is made in the exact image of God. This idea is further built upon by the same theologians and philosophers to decide exactly what this statement means, and it is the general consensus amongst this group that the soul contains inherent within it all the forces within God, and, by extension, the potential for the divine authority which God has. Magicians then take these working philosophies and make the connection that if one releases the potential of the soul to obtain divine authority, then he may influence the world in a manner similar to a god. The only place where practical spirituality steps beyond the realm of theoretical metaphysics is when a group of people decides how to experiment with and verify the claim.

It is correct in the same sense, however, to say that in the end what is practiced is not metaphysics by its traditional term, should you not be willing to accept a rather irrelevant semantical change. Technically what is practiced here would be, according to the Oxford Dictionary, either occultism or sorcery, regardless of the things which a practicing occultist knows separates the many branches of spiritual practice from sorcery. These things, after all, are known to the initiated and not to the authors of the Oxford Dictionary.

Logged

<http://www.thedivinescience.org>

MachineChimera

Settling In

\*

Posts: 37

Karma: 0

[View Profile](#)

Re: New level of skepticism

« Reply #72 on: July 13, 2006, 05:11:30 PM »

### Quote

"Dude, I deleted my post before you replied... I did some back-tracking. Turns out that you replied to me for no real reason at all, speaking of illiterate. I said the "people" who posted originally on the other site did not know what metaphysical means. Since we know you have one definition down, yet you actually came back and accused ME of not knowing. Where is this aggression coming from? I already posted the Oxford definition twice."

This 'aggression' is coming from the fact that you are attempting to sully the good name and intention of Metaphysics as it is more predominantly used, and classically studied, by shoving it into lump inclusion of your fantasy "arts" into the philosophy itself, or at least it's good name. At least, when you say "metaphysical arts", there is some degree of separation, however marginal, that makes it easier to digest. Calling your spookery Metaphysics is, however semantical, downright offensive. The original greek philosophers meant Metaphysics to be a discipline of seeking truth specifically for those things not physical in nature, and thus discernable and puzzled out only by the power of logic and reason alone. Your spookery has no connection whatsoever to the noble quest for truth about the actual composition, function, or nature of the universe or existence/reality. Such is comparable to equating sexual rape with romantic intimacy, because they both include several of the same physical motions and mechanisms; the spirit, the essence and intention of the words are as far from each other in original intent and meaning as the words rape and romantic intimacy. As Prophecy already very succinctly addressed, that you may take a poll and decide that such is appropriate hereabouts, or even as Kobok pointed out, that a book might be published coining the phrase involving the word Metaphysical, and that phrase (metaphysical arts) be taken up by the occultist community (Perhaps not because it is more accurate a descriptor at all, but a more publically inoffensive one compared to 'occult'), does not equate to the two very disparate meanings being shared or same. By any stretch.

As to the backtracking, you posted that "the person talking doesn't know what metaphysics means either." or something to that nature. Enchia directly followed with "Machinechimera you mean. Yes, I could kick him in the \*#&@." You made no correction to him thereafter indicating that no, you did not mean me. So, according to the record you 'backtracked', on page one, it would seem to indicate by the heaviest of implications that you did in fact, express that I did not know what the term metaphysics meant.

« Last Edit: July 13, 2006, 05:15:22 PM by MachineChimera »      Logged

solstice

Dreamwalker

Posts By Osmosis

\*\*\*\*\*

Posts: 2114

Karma: -6



"Receive and transmit..."

[View Profile](#)

Re: New level of skepticm

« Reply #73 on: July 13, 2006, 05:15:21 PM »

My intention... dont you mean OXFORD?

"Transcending physical matter... beyond physical"

Logged

Tell all the Truth but tell it slant: Success in Circuit lies. Too bright for our infirm Delight. The Truth's superb surprise. As Lightning to the Children eased, with explanation kind. The Truth must dazzle gradually, or every man be blind.

Tefeari: The Giant Impact Hypothesis is a theory

yintwin

Settling In

\*

Posts: 13

Karma: 0

[View Profile](#)

Re: New level of skepticm

« Reply #74 on: July 13, 2006, 10:33:39 PM »

I don't know if this will assist any in settling this argument, but in the section of David Morehouse's Remote Viewing Training Course entitled the physics of metaphysics(part 1) he defines metaphysics as "A division of philosophy that is concerned with the fundamental nature of reality and being. The study of metaphysics includes ontology(dealing with the nature of being, or reality-phenomenology); cosmology(the scientific study of the form, content, and origin of the physical universe); and often epistemology(the study of the sources, origins, nature, and limits of knowledge). If I am not mistaken, I believe that both of the views being presented in this argument would fall into this more complete definition of metaphysics. In both parts 1 and 2, Morehouse goes into depth about the nature of the metaphysical as he sees it, as well as its influence on the physical realm. I will likely present these arguments in the An Alternative explanation for psi (amongst other things) topic located in the main hall, pending I have time to either directly quote or paraphrase, which would each take a lengthy bit of time considering my poor typing speed, the size of the material, and the difficulty of explaining the concepts without the ability to post the visual aids alongside the text.

To any who remain skeptics of psionics, I suggest reading Psychic Warrior, Morehouse's autobiography. If the CIA believed in the psychic phenomena enough to

fund a project for the purposes of collecting military intelligence, then I see no reasons why the nay Sayers can't. I know at this point I probably sound a lot like a promoter, but I assure you that I am not. I originally started unknowingly on the path of the metaphysical arts in a mere attempt to expand my consciousness. I had crude theories that allowed for the possibilities of psionic abilities, but when I read the book, I was convinced that they (psionic abilities) were real and achievable by anyone. It's worth a look.

Logged

"Human salvation lies in the hands of the creatively maladjusted." -Martin Luther King, Jr.

Pages: 1 ... 3 4 [5] 6 7 ... 9 Print

« previous next »

Jump to:

=> Main Hall

Powered by MySQL Powered by PHP Powered by SMF 1.1.18 | SMF © 2013, Simple Machines

Oxygen design by Bloc Valid XHTML 1.0! Valid CSS!

<http://forums.vociety.net/index.php/topic%2C8667.75.html>

1 capture

13 May 2013

Apr MAY Jun

13

2012 2013 2014

About this capture

The Veritas Society

\*

\*HomeForumsChatHelpSearchRetroLoginRegister

Welcome, Guest. Please login or register.

Did you miss your activation email?

May 13, 2013, 03:09:17 AM

Forever

Login with username, password and session length

Search:

Advanced search

207641 Posts in 14761 Topics by 18447 Members - Latest Member: - PhilipFor Most online today: 78 - most online ever: 430 (June 28, 2007, 02:58:51 PM)

+ The Veritas Society

| -+ The Auditorium

| | -+ Main Hall

| | | -+ New level of skepticism 0 Members and 1 Guest are viewing this topic. «  
previous next »

Pages: 1 ... 4 5 [6] 7 8 9 Print

Author Topic: New level of skepticism (Read 15190 times)

kobok

Veritas Council

Tech Team

Posts By Osmosis

\*\*\*\*\*

Posts: 4747

Karma: 148

Veritas Council

View Profile

Re: New level of skepticism

« Reply #75 on: July 13, 2006, 10:51:00 PM »

I thought we had concluded the definition debate? We all understand each other sufficiently to communicate now. I believe that is sufficient.

Quote from: MachineChimera on July 13, 2006, 11:58:33 AM

Which again, makes a case for how weak the field of parapsychology itself, is; it's more reputable proponents and practitioners do not even need a degree in the field within which they practice, in order to do so. Consider how many other fields of formal scientific research make such an allowance.

Nearly every interdisciplinary field does. Huge percentages, and often the majority of computational chemists, biophysicists, biochemists, computational neurobiologists, and so forth, are from a related area, because the granting of interdisciplinary degrees is rare. For the first 30 years or so of its existence, there were almost no computer science degrees. The majority of participants were mathematicians, engineers, physicists, or from other fields. This is not anomalous.

Quote from: MachineChimera on July 13, 2006, 11:58:33 AM

This 'evidence' only further serves to solidify most skeptic considerations; most real phenomena are proven with evidence that is not subject to being read one way or another, and differing statistically from failure to 'success', dependant upon who is doing the data analysis.

Statistical analysis for psi experiments uses the same standardized techniques as are in common use in other fields. Ironically, parapsychology is the only field in which uneducated skeptics come along and presume those techniques "must be flawed" without even understanding the basic statistics. This is not a problem with the statistical techniques, but with the preconceptions and lack of education of those who object to them.

Quote from: MachineChimera on July 13, 2006, 11:58:33 AM

Your comical condescending aside, taking a course on statistics does not implicate a change of heart at all in consideration for the data, as many in the scientific community, such as figures with masters degrees in mathematics (care to claim you're more familiar with statistical work than they are, by chance?)

Yes, I apparently am. I've taken courses on probability, statistics, research design, numerous other undergraduate and graduate level courses on mathematics, and I use probability and statistics on a regular basis in my research. In fact, if you wanted to spend the time, I could probably teach you the basics of statistics sufficient to understand and calculate the results and analyses used in standard psi experiments, but it would probably take quite some time and commitment on your part to learn the material.

Quote from: MachineChimera on July 13, 2006, 11:58:33 AM

More to the point, if you attempt something enough times, it is -certain- you will have deviations from the statistical expected, 'chance' or average expected.

The exact value for how often something should happen is called an "expectation value", and tells you exactly how many occurrences you should expect given a probability and the number of times attempted. For the trivial case of a discrete event with a probability  $p$  of the event happening and  $r$  runs, the expectation value  $\langle E \rangle$  is simply  $p \cdot r$ . So in essence, the probability of an event and the number of runs literally tell you the average number of events you should expect by chance.

What's more, not only can you calculate the expectation value, but you can also calculate the distribution of results of you were to do  $r$  runs an infinite number of times. Depending on the situation or setup, this is usually either a Poisson distribution, as in the above case of a rare event, or a normal distribution (aka Gaussian distribution) in the case of a uniformly distributed event, like the average of a random number generator choosing between 0 or 1.

In the case of both of these distributions, the width of those distributions grows narrower and narrower as  $N$  (or  $r$ , the number of runs) gets higher (this is the width relative to the expectation value in the case of the poisson distribution, which approaches the gaussian in shape as  $N$  increases), which means that the distributions become more centered around the expectation value. This means that not only do you have the estimate of the expectation value, but the more runs you do, the closer your actual value will be to that expectation value. As  $N$  gets very large, the odds of even a small

deviation from that expectation value become astronomically small.

Quote from: MachineChimera on July 13, 2006, 11:58:33 AM

In the faraday isolated RNG, did they dim the lights and put ping-pong ball halves over the subjects' eyes?

Frequently. The ganzfeld approach has become quite prominent in the last 20 years.

Quote from: MachineChimera on July 13, 2006, 11:58:33 AM

Or have them stare directly at the machine?

Sometimes, but rarely. While I have heard of this being done, usually more isolation is preferred.

Quote from: MachineChimera on July 13, 2006, 11:58:33 AM

Did they test to see the results of having people there trying not to affect the machine at all, to determine if it's actual concentration or 'psionic intent' of some sort that caused the deviations, or if the deviations were occurring anomalous to the person's presence or concentration at all?

Yes, in nearly every experiment. This is how the control run is usually done, to make sure the results are actually intent dependent. This is core to the basic approach used in almost every experiment.

Quote from: MachineChimera on July 13, 2006, 11:58:33 AM

How long did the run the RNG out in tests WITHOUT any subjects present at all, to get baseline deviations, to compare to what statistical calculations indicate the deviations should be?

Usually this is for the exact same length of time as the experimental run. Whenever possible, it is best to keep things exactly the same for the control run as for the experimental run, with the only thing varying being the variable of interest, in this case, the instruction for the participant to exert intent to make the desired change. And this is how it is usually done.

In a few cases I've heard of experiments in which much more lengthy control runs were also done to check the equipment thoroughly before and after the experiment.

Quote from: MachineChimera on July 13, 2006, 11:58:33 AM

Psychics are not running around claiming to be able to predict what random numbers will be in an RNG in advance. They are claiming to move macro-scale/non-atomic sized objects with their minds, know events happening in different places, or in the future, or to be able to read other's thoughts. None of these RNG tests address or test those claims, and again, for the reason that all such claim testing will fail in a laboratory setting for solid evidence.

I have a more simple question for you... What reporting of this would you accept? "I saw him move the paperclip. Then he moved it again"? That's not what scientific papers look like, so they take more rigorous measurements when attempting to assess things more carefully, and this means using isolated RNGs.

You tell me specifically what reporting of the motion of a paperclip in a scientific journal you would accept. If you have no answer, then you are not being honest with us or yourself.

Quote from: MachineChimera on July 13, 2006, 11:58:33 AM

You seem to feel somehow that Blackmore's research and expert opinion are somehow marred by her previous involvement with drug use in her younger years. I'm rather confident that you will not, in turn, make the same implication about Aleister Crowley and his contributions to occultism. I wonder why that is.

It's not Blackmore's drug use in her younger years, it's her continued and ongoing focus on drug use, and the fact that her own drug induced states of consciousness are more interesting to her than reality. This is not the making of a critical or objective scientist. If you think it is, you should reassess your judgment.

As for A. Crowley, I already told you that Crowley is of no significant interest to me. I do not approve of most of his ethics, personal choices, and so forth, nor do I find his opinions on the occult to be particularly relevant to my practice of psi. I'm sorry if that inconveniences you, but not everyone interested in something you don't believe in can be categorized into the same group.

Quote from: MachineChimera on July 13, 2006, 11:58:33 AM

You pointed me to an excellent source of supportive propaganda for the occult/parapsychological belief in psychic abilities, and a source which has been heavily criticized by many well educated professionals in turn.

Have you, by any chance, READ The Conscious Universe? Here's one chapter from his book called The Field Guide to Skepticism. Please read it so that you have a better idea of the mindset of the man you are rebuking.

Quote from: MachineChimera on July 13, 2006, 11:58:33 AM

A source that was written by a man that cannot even explain the meaning of the data patterns he evidently seeks to use as proof for his claims in said book, and answers inquiries about same to the nature of "I don't know" repeatedly. Awesome, solid groundwork you're providing in support, on that note. "I don't know" is always a "conclusive", "overwhelming", "astronomical" amount of inspiration to ME personally when it comes to assuring the validity of research (Try not to slip in that sarcasm).

"I don't know" was the correct answer to the question he was asked. He was NOT asked a question about conventional psi experiments. He was asked a question about a single recent preliminary test of a new design, for which results are NOT yet

conclusive, and further investigation is still ongoing. Thus, when he says "I don't know", that is in fact, honesty. He does not know what it is yet, and thus, when asked what it is, he says he does not know. That is the mark of a good and objective scientist. Ridiculing him for that is naive.

Quote from: MachineChimera on July 13, 2006, 11:58:33 AM

What is surprising is your continued assertion that "EVERY FIELD" keeps their data exclusively to their own field's journals, when many popular publications exist, like the New Scientist mentioned earlier.

Since that's the second time you referenced "New Scientist" as some absolute authority on scientific truth, allow me to clarify something for you... New Scientist, despite the second word in the name, is NOT a scientific journal. It is a MAGAZINE for laymen. It has no peer review, and thus, does not contain peer reviewed journal articles. Of the many physicists I know, I cannot think of one who even reads New Scientist.

Quote from: MachineChimera on July 13, 2006, 11:58:33 AM

18/25 would be astonishing, if it were predicted or claimed (as would evidence an INTENT or conscious involvement with the results, and a connection between the individual receiving them.) before the results occurred.

It IS claimed by intent before it is done. The intent is to try to get as many right as possible. Would you consider Babe Ruth a fraud if he predicted his batting average for a year would be 0.37, and it were then in fact 0.34? Of course not. Babe Ruth simply went out on the field and tried to hit as many as he could as his "intent".

If you are thinking anything other than this about the human performance of psi, then you are misunderstanding what psi is.

Quote from: MachineChimera on July 13, 2006, 11:58:33 AM

No event is technically dictated by chance, but in fact is deterministic in design.

Wrong wrong wrong wrong wrong. Quantum mechanics dictates that quantum mechanical events, such as the decay of particles, and other small atomic fluctuations, ARE dictated purely and fundamentally by chance, and are NOT deterministic in design. Determinism as a rule went out with the days of Newton.

And, in fact, quantum mechanical chance events ARE used in some of the random number generators used in psi experiments. This has been a topic of interest in a couple of Foundations of Physics journal articles in the last couple decades.

Quote from: MachineChimera on July 13, 2006, 11:58:33 AM

Which is, again, not a constantly repeated formula: those same individuals that got that 4% difference you're so fond of, did not repeat and get the same, or very similar, results every time, or even consistently.

Actually, yes they have. The only requirement is that people must be given time to rest between sessions, since of course, continually exerting intent can be somewhat tiring. But provided breaks are given, results ARE indeed repeatable, and have been consistently repeatable for most of the 20th and 21st century.

Quote from: MachineChimera on July 13, 2006, 11:58:33 AM

oh, I get it! Psychic powers are things that do not function at the intention of the bearer of ability, but rather only as expressed over a period of attempts, in a situation where opposing factors are at work!

Close. Psi ability is a function of BOTH the intention of the bearer of the ability AND opposing factors (including distraction, lack of clarity in intent, doubt, etc). It is NOT easy to focus ones intent sufficiently to achieve good results.

Why you presume it would be easy to do something that you don't believe is possible is beyond me.

Quote from: MachineChimera on July 13, 2006, 11:58:33 AM

That is, again, your convenient viewpoint. I'll note that Utts has not challenged his fault-finding with her evidence in that article to date

Okay. And I'll note that you're wrong. Her website does rebut his claims:

<http://anson.ucdavis.edu/%7Eutts/response.html>

More mathematical detail is available here:

<http://anson.ucdavis.edu/%7Eutts/air2.html>

In addition, Radin, in the book you neglected to read, addresses some of the other errors and omissions in the Hyman article you pointed to.

Quote from: MachineChimera on July 13, 2006, 11:58:33 AM

Quote

"Yes, I've read this before. This man does not even understand the scientific method, which is understandable because this is not usually covered in a study of either mathematics OR philosophy. Radin makes a specific hypothesis beforehand, and then tests it after looking at the data. This man criticizes Radin for not examining all possible hypotheses after seeing which ones might fit with the data. If Claus Larsen knew anything at all about science or statistics, he would immediately know that his suggestion is lunacy, and would cause false positives in any data set. We call this "massaging the data" where I come from. Radin's method, however, is a correct application of the scientific method, as his hypothesis is generated, specified, and then examined using the data set. Because he makes singular hypotheses, he is able to generate a rigorous probability for obtaining those results by chance.



Larsen's proposal would make this impossible, and thus is nonscientific."

Of course he doesn't understand the scientific method. What would an individual under contract with the Consortium of Math and Science know about the scientific method? Rather, you suppose he does not, because he doesn't come to the same conclusion and appreciation of Radin's data and methodologies.

Actually, I conclude that he doesn't understand the scientific method because I can read, and I do understand the scientific method. Combining these two skills, it is quite simple to deduce that he does not. I don't expect you to believe this, as you arrived at this board with the preconclusion that everyone on it will not understand science. But since the only way around this is to discuss specific claims, and as you only made one specific claim, quoted below, I will address that:

Quote from: MachineChimera on July 13, 2006, 11:58:33 AM

So he has data that does not fit his hypothesis, but is ignoring the parts that don't fit, and trying to focus on the parts that do.

Name Radin's hypothesis. Before you can claim that he has data which does not fit his hypothesis, you must first specify precisely what Radin's hypothesis was. So go ahead and do that.

Quote from: MachineChimera on July 13, 2006, 11:58:33 AM

One major claim? Really? I've -never- in all my reading of paranormal claims, come across a psychic that claimed to have the ability to alter probability.

Well, read more.

Quote from: MachineChimera on July 13, 2006, 11:58:33 AM

Telekinesis, maybe, as to altering how dice end up settling when they're rolled, or other such feats where a force being expressed might alter the outcome of things dependant upon kinetic forces at work themselves, but never the ability to alter the behavior of random chance or probability.

When a division is made, psychokinesis is usually divided into two categories: Macro-psychokinesis and micro-psychokinesis. Micro-psychokinesis is considered to be the alteration of probability or the shifting of a statistical event. A dice experiment is usually not considered to be a force acting on the die, but instead, a direct action on the probability of that die. It has been shown in a number of studies that the ability to affect probability does not depend on the complexity of the system involved, and thus, is not mediated by a force affecting the object, but by direct action on probability.

« Last Edit: July 13, 2006, 11:02:41 PM by kobok »      Logged

Enchia

Posts By Osmosis

\*\*\*\*\*

Posts: 875

Karma: 19

[View Profile](#)

Re: New level of skepticm

« Reply #76 on: July 14, 2006, 01:45:48 AM »

I did not read anything on this topic and perhaps it is mentioned before;

In the human mind there is something called the principle of "The thinker and the prover". What the thinker thinks the prover proofs". Machinechimera your thinker has been altered by science so what cannot be proven or is unlogical by science is not real and so your prover will alter all your paranormal perceptions to make it seem like untrue or the prover will give it an other cause.

If you where planning to use it against us then remember that what we are doing really manifests and not just look like if it happens. If one lights a candle using willpower the thinker can think what he wants and the prover can alter the perception as he likes but if a candle lights it lights. If one moves a chair across the room using telekinesis then again the thinker can think that it is not true and the prover will try to alter the perception but if the chair moves it just moves.

« Last Edit: July 14, 2006, 04:17:14 AM by Enchia »    Logged

MachineChimera

Settling In

\*

Posts: 37

Karma: 0

[View Profile](#)

Re: New level of skepticm

« Reply #77 on: July 14, 2006, 09:37:04 AM »

Quote

"Nearly every interdisciplinary field does. Huge percentages, and often the majority of computational chemists, biophysicists, biochemists, computational neurobiologists, and so forth, are from a related area, because the granting of interdisciplinary degrees is rare. For the first 30 years or so of its existence, there were almost no computer science degrees. The majority of participants were mathematicians, engineers, physicists, or from other fields. This is not anomalous."

Truly? So then the majority of those practicing and well-reputed in the field of Physics do not have degrees in Physics? And the majority, or even a significant portion, of

those practicing in the psychological community, do not have Psychology degrees? Sounds pretty anomalous to me. As to the issue of computer science, that's largely because computers are a relatively new invention, and as such there was nothing to study until their invention. Obviously, a field of study does not crop up before the subject itself of study and use exists. Hardly the case with parapsychology, which's subject has been around for quite a while. Indeed, what other fields of study exist for which there is a specific degree, and we find that the majority of it's professionals do not in fact have that degree?

Quote

"Statistical analysis for psi experiments uses the same standardized techniques as are in common use in other fields. Ironically, parapsychology is the only field in which uneducated skeptics come along and presume those techniques "must be flawed" without even understanding the basic statistics. This is not a problem with the statistical techniques, but with the preconceptions and lack of education of those who object to them."

The same standardized techniques commonly used in other fields, and yet after all this time, none of these techniques have yielded solid, inarguable, or even obvious, proof of authenticity? I don't think uneducated skeptics are claiming those same techniques are flawed, but rather that the assumptive apophenial testers and believers look at the data produced by such tests and see concrete evidence where there is none. As you stated, the techniques are in common use in other fields that yield results by these test methods, that are concrete and self-evident, not subject to personal opinion as to validity or not. Once more, we come full circle to that individuals with more training in statistics and mathematics in general arrive at different conclusions than you do, seeing the same data, and your explanation is that they do not understand what they're looking at, or mathematics/statistics themselves. That's an awfully presumptuous, and not at all scientific, way of looking at things. "If you agree with me, you understand statistics. If you do not, you need more education." I'll reiterate also that if the results were 'conclusive', 'overwhelming', and 'astronomical' as you earlier described, there wouldn't be all this debate; the evidence would be self-supportive, not subject to numerous qualified ridicules.

Quote

"Yes, I apparently am. I've taken courses on probability, statistics, research design, numerous other undergraduate and graduate level courses on mathematics, and I use probability and statistics on a regular basis in my research. In fact, if you wanted to spend the time, I could probably teach you the basics of statistics sufficient to understand and calculate the results and analyses used in standard psi experiments, but it would probably take quite some time and commitment on your part to learn the material."

Once more, you have the same experience with a few statistics classes, and courses on mathematics, or less, than many of the individuals ridiculing the significance or meaning of the results you cite as successes, yet somehow feel qualified to make judgment that

those of disparate opinion are not educated enough, whereas from the same level of education, or less, you somehow were educated enough. Such probably stems from your own belief as to your own intellectual acuity.

#### Quote

"The exact value for how often something should happen is called an "expectation value", and tells you exactly how many occurrences you should expect given a probability and the number of times attempted. For the trivial case of a discrete event with a probability  $p$  of the event happening and  $r$  runs, the expectation value  $\langle E \rangle$  is simply  $p \cdot r$ . So in essence, the probability of an event and the number of runs literally tell you the average number of events you should expect by chance.

What's more, not only can you calculate the expectation value, but you can also calculate the distribution of results of you were to do  $r$  runs an infinite number of times. Depending on the situation or setup, this is usually either a Poisson distribution, as in the above case of a rare event, or a normal distribution (aka Gaussian distribution) in the case of a uniformly distributed event, like the average of a random number generator choosing between 0 or 1.

In the case of both of these distributions, the width of those distributions grows narrower and narrower as  $N$  (or  $r$ , the number of runs) gets higher (this is the width relative to the expectation value in the case of the poisson distribution, which approaches the gaussian in shape as  $N$  increases), which means that the distributions become more centered around the expectation value. This means that not only do you have the estimate of the expectation value, but the more runs you do, the closer your actual value will be to that expectation value. As  $N$  gets very large, the odds of even a small deviation from that expectation value become astronomically small."

Indeed, and yet these deviations from the expectation of value, however astronomically small, do occur, and with great frequency, if we again look to Littlewood's Law. As such, you are not at liberty to point to such an 'astronomically small' chance actually coming to fruition as evidence of a cause for a phenomena that already has explainable causes, unless you can somehow show evidence that the activity you are claiming was the reason such a deviation occurred. That would be valid. You are instead attempting to assert that the deviation's occurrence is proof of the phenomena, which is rather backward. How about you get evidence that the phenomena claimed is causing the occurrence.

If a subject's active participation were required to effect such changes, that might make the results more consequential, but it's already been demonstrated that such is not even necessary. The deviations occur without focus, concentration, or intent. Indeed, it appears merely having somebody be involved with the RNG creates such deviations. And not all the time; indeed, the majority of the time, evidently, there is no measure of success above the statistically expressed expected. Also, repeatability does not mean it happens more than once. Repeatability means consecutively, or even better, Every time, to some degree. Please do show me an instance where ANY individual displays,

in every interaction with an RNG, above-chance expected values.

Quote

"Quote from: MachineChimera on July 13, 2006, 11:58:33 AM

In the faraday isolated RNG, did they dim the lights and put ping-pong ball halves over the subjects' eyes?

Frequently. The ganzfeld approach has become quite prominent in the last 20 years."

Mm. What's also been quite prominent is that, again, all that hooplah and serious treatment isn't even required; people can be reading magazines, daydreaming, lost in thought, and not at all concentrating or intent upon creating an effect at all, and they continue to happen, when they infrequently do. Obviously, no psychic intent or ability is required for these changes, since they sometimes occur in their absence as easily as in their supposed presence. So what we have here is an arguable 'evidence' of a deviation from chance, that is as much associable to the focus of a psychic working some mumbojumbo power over the outcome, as any other preposterous claim: I could say with a much, and as little, proof of connection between the results and any other idea, that same idea is responsible. I could say that the subjects' color of clothing is causing the deviations, or their choice of shoes, or their hair or eye color, and make the same evidence after reanalysis of successful results: People with green eyes were more capable of influencing the number of 1's produced than people with other, or that brunettes had more success influencing the RNG than blondes or redheads. It would be equally as erroneous; you are not at liberty to conjure from an occurrence, the reasons behind it, and state them as fact. You are required to demonstrate evidence of support for your suggested reason behind the occurrence, itself... not to apply the outcome of a test as proof an untested "cause." Testing a person's influence on an RNG is not a test of psychic ability. Perhaps testing a person's active, conscious attempt to influence the results, might be a test of psi on an RNG. But again, successful results are demonstrable without any intent to influence the results at all, so obviously intent or focus/conscious effort is not required. That rather invalidates the suggestion that psychic powers are at work, itself.

Quote

"Yes, in nearly every experiment. This is how the control run is usually done, to make sure the results are actually intent dependent. This is core to the basic approach used in almost every experiment."

Wrong, wrong, wrong, in your later words. They've indicated several times that conscious effort and focus is not required. Again, successes gleaned with subjects reading magazines or books, daydreaming, or doing some other activity. It's precisely this sort've shoe-horning that Radin was accused of, in his use of data to back his otherwise unfounded claims in the Conscious Universe, for which he repeatedly claimed "I don't know." I'll address that lower however.

Quote

"Quote from: MachineChimera on July 13, 2006, 11:58:33 AM

Psychics are not running around claiming to be able to predict what random numbers will be in an RNG in advance. They are claiming to move macro-scale/non-atomic sized objects with their minds, know events happening in different places, or in the future, or to be able to read other's thoughts. None of these RNG tests address or test those claims, and again, for the reason that all such claim testing will fail in a laboratory setting for solid evidence."

I have a more simple question for you... What reporting of this would you accept? "I saw him move the paperclip. Then he moved it again"? That's not what scientific papers look like, so they take more rigorous measurements when attempting to assess things more carefully, and this means using isolated RNGs.

You tell me specifically what reporting of the motion of a paperclip in a scientific journal you would accept. If you have no answer, then you are not being honest with us or yourself."

Reporting that actually has to do with the body of psychic claims in existence. If someone claims to be able to move things with their mind, they should be able to back that with a test actually related to the idea. If scientists and skeptics can set up a control area to assure no cheating/fraudulent use of tricks are in use, and the subject can be demonstrated to move the objects without actually touching them with his body, then that would obviously be a supporting claim. Further, for his claim to be valid, it has to be demonstrated that the paperclip never moves in the way his 'successes' do, without him being present for it, or without someone actually trying to move the object with their mind. Scientists could easily draw up the research and supporting material of people on hand, witnessing the motion, and involve cameras and slow-motion footage to further support the witnesses, that no fraud can have been found to be involved with the results, and that the paperclip in question did, in fact, move when the subject concentrated to do as he claimed he could. The same for clairvoyance, or any other cognitive ability, or the ability to 'know the future.' State a specific claim, something that obviously cannot be applied to any other instances, and be able to repeat similar accuracy as to predictions. That also could be documented and subject to control methods. Easily. Or any other number of such for the bogus claims floating around such sites, about magickal powers of summoning, conjuration, or energy manipulation, or constructs (\*choke.\*). I'm reminded certain humorous 'radki' videos, where people claim to be capable of producing physical chi effects or some such nonsense, and the way nothing happened. People claiming their teachers to be 'sensei shadow', among other laughables. I also like the degree of disdain that people here express for such things as radki, when their own claims of psychic powers or magickal feats are as unproven and as illogically based as radki.

Quote

"It's not Blackmore's drug use in her younger years, it's her continued and ongoing focus on drug use, and the fact that her own drug induced states of consciousness are

more interesting to her than reality. This is not the making of a critical or objective scientist. If you think it is, you should reassess your judgment."

Primarily, even if she does continue to use drugs, so long as she does not pollute her scientific assertions by some incorrect involvement of them or their effects in arriving at her assertions, it's of no consequence. That notwithstanding, drug use has often been used by occult figures as well, for the 'mentally liberating' effects it has. Evidently sensory deprivation, limitation, and meditation are all valid means of altering the consciousness in order to produce paranormal activity, but the altered state of consciousness coming from her choice of venue is not. Again, I find that a convenient resource of implication, when you've made no distinction whatsoever as to what altered states are valid supports to psi abilities, and which are of no consequence, and neither have backed such a statement as to what are valid means to arriving at them. This, much like so called 'psychics' on such sites as these, ridiculing "radki", and then turning around and claiming to be able to influence the weather, summon spirits (which themselves, have not been proven, etc, etc.), imbue the semblance of life into constructs, or to harm others physically or mentally by the powah of the Terribl3f3AR mind... strike me as a repeated, ridiculous pattern of people making irrational claims, and then ridiculing other equally irrational claims, or trying to argue logically about the behavior of their so called psychic powers.

Quote

"As for A. Crowley, I already told you that Crowley is of no significant interest to me. I do not approve of most of his ethics, personal choices, and so forth, nor do I find his opinions on the occult to be particularly relevant to my practice of psi. I'm sorry if that inconveniences you, but not everyone interested in something you don't believe in can be categorized into the same group."

Again, you tip-toe very smoothly around the issue of an important Occult figure, careful not to offend others here that DO believe in Crowley's work or opinions on the subject. I'll again assert that you should demonstrate then another prominent figure in the occult, that does have relevance to your practice of Psi.

Quote

"Have you, by any chance, READ The Conscious Universe? Here's one chapter from his book called The Field Guide to Skepticism. Please read it so that you have a better idea of the mindset of the man you are rebuking."

I have indeed read it, and find it riddled with the same manner of assertions he is leveling towards detractors in the self-same chapter. He states "wrong" as to the statement that "Despite the endless pronouncements and anecdotes in the popular press, and despite a steady trickle of serious research on such things, there is no significant or trustworthy evidence that such phenomena even exist. The wide gap between popular conviction on this matter, and the actual evidence, is something that itself calls for research. For there is not a single parapsychological effect that can be repeatedly or reliably produced in any laboratory suitably equipped to perform and

control the experiment. Not one.", yet makes no backing of it by providing a case list of all the supposedly repeated, reliably produced effects in a suitably equipped and controlled library. If there are 'half a dozen' psi effects as he claims that have met such a standard, he ought to very easily list them, as they seem evidently to be directly and specifically upon his mind at the time, to come up with such an estimation. He continues to claim that evidence has been provided that did meet the standards, and was measured success, as though it were fact, when in fact the very claims he's discussing are -still- to this day being met with credible doubt and naysaying. He simply, as you do, look aside from logical faults found in such experiments, which have ranged from lack of proper control in the test environment (9 of the 28 test studies, and the largest group of 'successes' in them to be applied to the overall study of deviation by "4%" from the expected, came from the same laboratory, and the subjects testing were known/familiar to the lab techs, for instance.), to data leakage, and so on. There has not been to present ONE repeatable test outcome indicative of something psi related going on that cannot be, using the same data coallated, be shown to be a marginal success, or no success at all, dependant upon who's reviewing the data, and by what criteria they're using. Hardly convincing 'evidence' at all. I'm hard pressed to think of any modern day physically manifesting phenomena that exists at all that had evidence of it's existance hotly contested for so long a period of time, that has actually been proven to be existant. Yet another exception to the norm, which psi-proponents would have reasonable individuals swallow. He makes such statements as "As we've seen, the meta-analyses described earlier have shown that design flaws cannot account for the cumulative success rates in psi experiments", when further meta-analyses have indeed shown just that. Only that when it happens, proponents like yourself attempt to dispel such by stating the reviewer clearly doesn't understand statistics, or somesuch. I'll also note that he attempts the following "After a hundred years and thousands of experiments, there are still vigorous controversies over such elementary phenomena as conscious awareness, memory, learning, and perception. " when his examples are, unlike psi, all things dealing with ephemeral issues, not physically manifested phenomena such as many psi claims are.

Also, as to Radin, enjoy this link. <http://www.csicop.org/sb/2002-12/reality-check.html> Wherein a PROFESSOR of statistics, who of a certainty is better trained, and more proficient with judging both the merit of statistical data, and it's meaning, says this. "In his review of Radin's book for the journal Nature, statistics professor I.J. Good disputes this calculation, calling it "a gross overestimate." He estimates that the number of unpublished, unsuccessful reports needed to account for the results by the file drawer effect should be reduced to fifteen or less. How could two meta-analyses result in such a wide discrepancy? Somebody is doing something wrong, and in this case it is clearly Radin. He has not performed the file-drawer analysis correctly."

We have also "Douglas Stokes is a specialist in statistical analysis who is very sympathetic to the psi movement. In his book *The Nature of Mind*, Stokes considers the wide range of reports of psychic phenomena, from the anecdotal to the experimental. Although he concludes that psi has not been scientifically demonstrated, he still wants to believe in it based on the "compelling stories" he has heard and his own personal



"spontaneous psi experiences." Nevertheless, in an article published in *Skeptical Inquirer* (25[3], May/June 2001, 22-25), Stokes describes the fundamental errors that Radin and others have made in their calculations. ""

You'll note that the author of the article linked, mentioning all these things, is professor emeritus of physics and astronomy, similarly better educated than you we can be sure, and similarly criticizing both the validity, and the methods of data collection, as far as Radin goes. So we have extremely well educated statisticians coming out left and right, finding Radin's claims flawed. Your attempt to belittle the nay-saying rebuttals by claiming they 'don't understand statistics', is obviously a dead duck. People that understand and practice statistics far better than you, for example, and for a living, which you do not, fail to see your 'successes' too. Obviously, failing to find Radin's or Utts' conclusions meaningful has nothing to do with a lack of understanding of statistics or scientific method, but rather who's looking at the data. "Conclusive", "astronomical", "overwhelming" proof indeed.

As to the validity of Dean Radin writing on skepticism at all, or attempting to lay the ground work for what would be valid skepticism as to his work, we'll consider the following. "That didn't sound too skeptical to me, so I investigated further and found that Dean Radin is listed as one of the Associates and Advisors for these genuine skeptics, along with Larry Dossey (who has scientific proof that prayer heals), Gary Schwartz (who has scientific proof that John Edward gets messages from the dead), and Rupert Sheldrake (who has scientific proof that people know when they're being stared at and that some pets are psychic). (The site is registered to Dr. Sheldrake who seems to have discovered an interesting way to deal with critics.) These and other like-minded genuine skeptics say that in addition to promoting genuine skepticism their purpose "includes an open-minded investigation of unexplained phenomena, a questioning of dogmatic assumptions, and a skeptical examination of the claims of self-proclaimed skeptics." They even list a dead man as one of their advisers (Marcello Truzzi). No one can say they aren't an open-minded sort of group."

"They even have a Field Guide to Skepticism, which consists of a defense of Radin and an attack on his skeptical critics. There is also a page called A Who's Who of Media Skeptics - Skeptics or Dogmatists? The first on the list is Susan Blackmore. I was tempted to write Dr. Sheldrake and inform him that her latest book isn't the one on memes but is on consciousness. I'd like to ask him about Radin's claim that "the nature of human consciousness" has been a "taboo topic." I'll bet that's news to Dr. Blackmore. I know it was to me."

"I have read large chunks of Dossey, Schwartz, and Radin, and the only thing they are skeptical of is skepticism. "

"Radin claims there are thousands of experiments that prove psi exists. But the truth is that there are many psi experiments that have found interesting statistical data. He calls these anomalies. They aren't anomalies. The discovery that the statistical data for a random number generator is not likely due to chance is not the discovery of an anomaly

in the same sense that the discovery of X-rays was an anomaly. Finding a statistic that is not likely due to chance is not an anomaly. It is an indication that some kind of causal event is most likely occurring. There is no justification for assuming a law of nature or a basic scientific theory has been violated when an odd statistic is discovered. Yet, Radin and some of his fellow psi researchers treat any statistically significant result in a psi experiment as proof not only that psi exists but as proof that the fundamental assumptions of natural science (materialism and determinism) must be abandoned."

I could go on, but believe this sufficient for now.

#### Quote

"I don't know" was the correct answer to the question he was asked. He was NOT asked a question about conventional psi experiments. He was asked a question about a single recent preliminary test of a new design, for which results are NOT yet conclusive, and further investigation is still ongoing. Thus, when he says "I don't know", that is in fact, honesty. He does not know what it is yet, and thus, when asked what it is, he says he does not know. That is the mark of a good and objective scientist. Ridiculing him for that is naive."

That it was the correct and honest answer, we will agree upon. Shoehorning his data however, was not. I wasn't aware that fitting pieces data that seem to support one's claim, and ignoring the relevance or meaning of other data that doesn't support the claim, had become good and objective scientific work. Ridiculing him in that pursuit is however, entirely not naive. It is, in your own words, correct and honest. That's about the equivalent of me stating that it rains because the sun is up, and affects the clouds. I could point to the times when the sun was prevailing, and it rained, and say "See! I told you!" And then, when it rains at night and the sun isn't reigning, answer "Why did it rain just now, then?" with "I don't know." Just like Radin did. It would be the same manner of shoehorning data. Ridiculous.

#### Quote

"Since that's the second time you referenced "New Scientist" as some absolute authority on scientific truth, allow me to clarify something for you... New Scientist, despite the second word in the name, is NOT a scientific journal. It is a MAGAZINE for laymen. It has no peer review, and thus, does not contain peer reviewed journal articles. Of the many physicists I know, I cannot think of one who even reads New Scientist."

I did not reference it at all as some absolute authority about scientific truth. It is however a scientific publication. As to your attempt to implicate it's obscurity, it has well over 680,000 subscribers, is the 40th in the list of most-linked-to news organisations and the only science and technology specialist in the top 100, and "is not a peer-reviewed scientific journal, but it is widely read by both nonscientists and scientists."

#### Quote

"It IS claimed by intent before it is done. The intent is to try to get as many right as possible. Would you consider Babe Ruth a fraud if he predicted his batting average for a year would be 0.37, and it were then in fact 0.34? Of course not. Babe Ruth simply went out on the field and tried to hit as many as he could as his "intent"."

No, a specific claim is not made. "I will now affect the number of 1's produced by this randomly generating machine." is not a specific claim. It does not at all denote in what manner the subject plans to affect the machine, or in what way. If a baseball hitter claims "I can hit 20 home runs out of 100 pitches", that is a specific claim. If he claims "I've a real talent for hitting home runs", and then demonstrates no talent immediately for such, and indeed scores only, say, 4% more homeruns over the course of his career than the average ballplayer does, he will not be remembered in history, or said to be, a homerun hitter with talent. He will, at best, be said to be someone that hit more home runs than the usual guy, which is essentially what is being said by Utts and Radin, as far as the RNG's go. Though, as I've above indicated, even those 'successes' are under fire as to their validity or honesty at all.

Quote

"Wrong wrong wrong wrong wrong. Quantum mechanics dictates that quantum mechanical events, such as the decay of particles, and other small atomic fluctuations, ARE dictated purely and fundamentally by chance, and are NOT deterministic in design. Determinism as a rule went out with the days of Newton. And, in fact, quantum mechanical chance events ARE used in some of the random number generators used in psi experiments. This has been a topic of interest in a couple of Foundations of Physics journal articles in the last couple decades."

Arguably, and arguably not, depending upon which side of the fence you're on. Einstein and Bohm for instance, were hidden variables determinists, and they are not alone. To this day, many physicists side with the Bohm interpretation of QM/Bohmian mechanics. Gerard Hooft indeed published in 1999 Quantum Gravity as a Dissipative Deterministic System, pointing out flaws in the present model of non-determinist quantum mechanics. Once more, your belief system and opinion on results, do not make them factual.

Quote

"Actually, yes they have. The only requirement is that people must be given time to rest between sessions, since of course, continually exerting intent can be somewhat tiring. But provided breaks are given, results ARE indeed repeatable, and have been consistently repeatable for most of the 20th and 21st century."

Oh yeah? So, every time these people are tested with the RNG in the same environment, they yield results about or around 4% away from the normal expected, every time the test is run? I linked earlier to where the test result successes in fact couldn't be reproduced on a different RNG, even when the PEAR group coordinated with german scientists. That's not exactly repeatable sounding to me.

Quote

"Close. Psi ability is a function of BOTH the intention of the bearer of the ability AND opposing factors (including distraction, lack of clarity in intent, doubt, etc). It is NOT easy to focus ones intent sufficiently to achieve good results.

Why you presume it would be easy to do something that you don't believe is possible is beyond me."

What is beyond -me- is that you continue to refer to such weak, indeed fiercely attacked claims of successful results as evidence of the existance of something that, by all rights, and with all manner of claims much LARGER and more powerful/obvious in effect than on a micro scale, none of which have been demonstrated themselves. I do not believe it should be easy to produce a difficult result. I believe it should be easy to produce a difficult result conclusively, in hundreds of years of claims, or at least in the most recent 5 decades. I believe that with all these claims on this website, and many others in the parapsychological community about weather-control, summoning spirits, telekinetic energies, elemental manipulation, telepathy, psychic visions of the future, chi force useful on a physical scale to an extent as to actually be applicable to a fight, and so on running rampant, that at least ONE person with such abilities could step forward and produce them in a way more powerful and obvious than a statistical percentage of deviation greater than what is expected to happen by sheer luck, if such abilities actually existed. That in the face of millions in rewards being offered, and revolution of history in return for such a display, none have actually stepped up and done so, you and others like you continue to believe and attempt to back such fantasy, is mind blowing.

Quote

"Okay. And I'll note that you're wrong. Her website does rebut his claims:

<http://anson.ucdavis.edu/%7Eutts/response.html> More mathematical detail is available here: <http://anson.ucdavis.edu/%7Eutts/air2.html>

In addition, Radin, in the book you neglected to read, addresses some of the other errors and omissions in the Hyman article you pointed to."

They'll have a lot more rebuttals to make, as the links and quotes I've placed above well illustrate.. Perhaps they should be reviewing their own mathematical details, and doing so without prediliction to look for indications of success while ignoring data that's non sequitor to their assertions.

Quote

"Actually, I conclude that he doesn't understand the scientific method because I can read, and I do understand the scientific method. Combining these two skills, it is quite simple to deduce that he does not. I don't expect you to believe this, as you arrived at this board with the preconclusion that everyone on it will not understand science. But since the

only way around this is to discuss specific claims, and as you only made one specific claim, quoted below, I will address that:"

Perhaps you should read, and review the scientific method, again, as, once more we

see that very well educated, respectable members of their scientific communities are concurring with Larsen's viewpoint and criticisms, as to Radin and Utts' "evidence."

Quote

"Name Radin's hypothesis. Before you can claim that he has data which does not fit his hypothesis, you must first specify precisely what Radin's hypothesis was. So go ahead and do that."

So far as his graphical data, and the book at large go, his hypothesis seems to be that when many people are focused on one thing, it influences stochastic processes. Done.

Quote

"One major claim? Really? I've -never- in all my reading of paranormal claims, come across a psychic that claimed to have the ability to alter probability."

"Well, read more."

I can read until the cows come home, but even if I do stumble across an account where a psychic is claiming the power to affect the outcome of probability-based events, it will be down so far as the percentage of claims NOT based on such a thing. The most prevalent claims, and the ones most proven by polls as well heard of and familiar to the population in general, are clairvoyance, telepathy, telekinesis, and other such grand claims. Psychics, even historically, have not ran around claiming to be able to influence random number generators. They claim to know the future, or to bend bars or spoons, or move macro-scale objects, or to read thoughts, or to visit places out of their bodies. However you desire to take my meaning literally and out of context, as to implicate that such actually does exist as a major psychic claim, it will still be an erroneous assertion.

Quote

"When a division is made, psychokinesis is usually divided into two categories: Macro-psychokinesis and micro-psychokinesis. Micro-psychokinesis is considered to be the alteration of probability or the shifting of a statistical event. A dice experiment is usually not considered to be a force acting on the die, but instead, a direct action on the probability of that die. It has been shown in a number of studies that the ability to affect probability does not depend on the complexity of the system involved, and thus, is not mediated by a force affecting the object, but by direct action on probability."

Indeed. So where are the successful tests of Macro-scale psychokinesis? Where are the moving, non-debunked paperclips in controlled environments, or the rattling coke cans, or the levitating feathers or papers? Suspiciously absentee, along with all the majority of other, familiar psychic claims and magickal hoo-ha. Well, perhaps not so suspiciously after all, all things considered. But certainly absentee.

« Last Edit: July 14, 2006, 11:33:13 AM by MachineChimera »      Logged

solstice

Dreamwalker

Posts By Osmosis

\*\*\*\*\*

Posts: 2114

Karma: -6

"Receive and transmit..."

[View Profile](#)

Re: New level of skepticm

« Reply #78 on: July 14, 2006, 11:58:33 AM »

The "occult" and "psychic phenomena" are not synonyms. One refers to something "obscure" such as your notion of spookery, while the other is more specific, which is not obscure at. Crowley was a magician and drug addict; he was never the subject of any psychical experiments, n'or has anything he claimed to do been tested in a lab.

Logged

Tell all the Truth but tell it slant: Success in Circuit lies. Too bright for our infirm Delight. The Truth's superb surprise. As Lightning to the Children eased, with explanation kind. The Truth must dazzle gradually, or every man be blind.

Tefeari: The Giant Impact Hypothesis is a theory

MachineChimera

Settling In

\*

Posts: 37

Karma: 0

[View Profile](#)

Re: New level of skepticm

« Reply #79 on: July 14, 2006, 12:28:10 PM »

Quote

"The "occult" and "psychic phenomena" are not synonyms. One refers to something "obscure" such as your notion of spookery, while the other is more specific, which is not obscure at. Crowley was a magician and drug addict; he was never the subject of any psychical experiments, n'or has anything he claimed to do been tested in a lab."

No, they are not synonyms. Psi abilities fall under the Occult umbrella, however, so to refer to psychic phenomena as matters of the occult is not inaccurate, but less specific. The occult in general however, is no more or less 'obscure' than Psi abilities.

Logged

solstice  
Dreamwalker  
Posts By Osmosis  
\*\*\*\*\*

Posts: 2114  
Karma: -6

"Receive and transmit..."

[View Profile](#)

Re: New level of skepticm  
« Reply #80 on: July 14, 2006, 12:29:55 PM »  
They do not fall under the occult umbrella, because that umbrella and its constituents have nothing to do with the scientific investigations presented. Scientists are not interested in spells, or charms, or potions; they are interested in how the mind may affect what we percieve to be reality.

Logged  
Tell all the Truth but tell it slant: Success in Circuit lies. Too bright for our infirm Delight. The Truth's superb surprise. As Lightning to the Children eased, with explanation kind. The Truth must dazzle gradually, or every man be blind.  
Tefeari: The Giant Impact Hypothesis is a theory  
MachineChimera  
Settling In

\*

Posts: 37  
Karma: 0

[View Profile](#)

Re: New level of skepticm  
« Reply #81 on: July 14, 2006, 12:41:06 PM »  
Well, if the Occult meant specifically "Charms, spells, potions" and so forth, that would be applicable. It does not, and so it isn't, respectively.

Logged  
solstice  
Dreamwalker  
Posts By Osmosis  
\*\*\*\*\*

Posts: 2114

Karma: -6

"Receive and transmit..."

[View Profile](#)

Re: New level of skepticism

« Reply #82 on: July 14, 2006, 12:51:38 PM »

Well... the occult in any context does not embody or necessarily include psychic phenomena. By virtue of the evidence submitted, psychic acts are not obscure or secret.

Logged

Tell all the Truth but tell it slant: Success in Circuit lies. Too bright for our infirm Delight. The Truth's superb surprise. As Lightning to the Children eased, with explanation kind. The Truth must dazzle gradually, or every man be blind.

Tefeari: The Giant Impact Hypothesis is a theory

Salubron

Greenhorn

A Veritas Regular

\*\*

Posts: 64

Karma: 0

Greenhorn

[View Profile](#)

Re: New level of skepticism

« Reply #83 on: July 14, 2006, 01:14:09 PM »

MachineChimera, I find your argument is degrading. Mostly because you seem to completely ignore/miss things when responding.

Quote from: MachineChimera on July 14, 2006, 09:37:04 AM

Truly? So then the majority of those practicing and well-reputed in the field of Physics do not have degrees in Physics? And the majority, or even a significant portion, of those practicing in the psychological community, do not have Psychology degrees? Sounds pretty anomalous to me. As to the issue of computer science, that's largely



because computers are a relatively new invention, and as such there was nothing to study until their invention. Obviously, a field of study does not crop up before the subject itself of study and use exists. Hardly the case with parapsychology, which's subject has been around for quite a while. Indeed, what other fields of study exist for which there is a specific degree, and we find that the majority of it's professionals do not in fact have that degree?

He said interdisciplinary field. You should have at least gotten that from the examples he listed. Last time I checked, Physics wasn't an interdisciplinary field.

Or when you asked.

Quote

Did they test to see the results of having people there trying not to affect the machine at all, to determine if it's actual concentration or 'psionic intent' of some sort that caused the deviations, or if the deviations were occurring anomalous to the person's presence or concentration at all?

Even though when he explained in the experiment that he described that they measured the RNG when it was not being affected and came up with an average of .500000, there are other things, but you are more and more just simply ignoring/skipping important points.

« Last Edit: July 14, 2006, 01:15:59 PM by Salubrion »      Logged

MachineChimera

Settling In

\*

Posts: 37

Karma: 0

[View Profile](#)

Re: New level of skepticism

« Reply #84 on: July 14, 2006, 02:09:14 PM »

Quote

Well... the occult in any context does not embody or necessarily include psychic phenomena. By virtue of the evidence submitted, psychic acts are not obscure or secret."- Solstice

Really? The occult doesn't by definition, cover psychic phenomena? You need to check the definition of occult again, boyo. And by 'virtue' of the evidence submitted, psychic acts are not obscure, or secret, in claim. Neither are occult acts: you'll find shows all over prime time tv regarding magic practicing witches, wizards on the big cinema screen, and all manner of other popular stories regarding all manner of aspects

of the occult. If you think to make the so called 'Psi' realm seem somehow more credible in claiming it's more well known/less obscure, you're failing miserably. In fact, there are more shows on tv about Occult related shows NOT relating to psychic abilities, than there are shows about psychics. It could be argued that popular culture is more familiar with the former, then with your psi arts.

Quote

"He said interdisciplinary field. You should have at least gotten that from the examples he listed. Last time I checked, Physics wasn't an interdisciplinary field.

Or when you asked.

"Did they test to see the results of having people there trying not to affect the machine at all, to determine if it's actual concentration or 'psionic intent' of some sort that caused the deviations, or if the deviations were occurring anomalous to the person's presence or concentration at all?"

Even though when he explained in the experiment that he described that they measured the RNG when it was not being affected and came up with an average of .500000, there are other things, but you are more and more just simply ignoring/skipping important points."

I'm not skipping or ignoring important points, I'm emphasizing that there are counterbalances to the points he claims, which he seems to be stating as though they are somehow overruling or of some greater importance. He ignores the instances where the very same conditions meet with failure, and tries to push into the light of discourse the 'evidence' of when conditions indicate some modicum of "success."

Also, we weren't talking about interdisciplinary fields, at first. That was his choice of wording, and it could as much be argued that physics is related to parapsychology, as that mathematics is related to physics. Yet, strangely, you do not need a mathematics degree to practice physics. You get a physics degree. So, unless there's some formal list of what are classified as 'interdisciplinary' fields, I expect that he was simply calling it such out of convenience, when in fact many fields contain elements of others, yet still the practitioners get primary degrees in the actual field itself.

« Last Edit: July 14, 2006, 02:13:36 PM by MachineChimera »

Logged

Azazen

Regular Member

A Veritas Regular

\*\*

Posts: 87

Karma: 0

Regular Member

[View Profile](#)

Re: New level of skepticm

« Reply #85 on: July 14, 2006, 03:25:18 PM »

You must not be able to comprehend what .500000 means. it means that if say 1,000,000 numbers were generated that there was -no- fluxuation and exactly 50% of the generated numbers were 1's and exactly 50% were 0's. The zero's added after the 5 mean something in case you didn't realize.

It also means that in the numbers generated while the person was trying to change the outcome that out of 1,000,000 numbers there were 20,000 fluxuations.

Hmm, that's odd... that's 2,000,000% more fluxuations than when there was no one concentrating on the machine... but I'm sure we can write that off as mere coincidence.

And keep in mind this isn't an isolated incident like your example of babies being born. This is over a long period of time with someone working towards a specific goal, to produce one's instead of zero's. Which you can plainly see by simple math that while the subject was concentrating there were more 1's than zero's, and not just a small percentage more, there were 2,000,000% more extra one's when the subject was concentrating than there were extra one's when no one was concentrating on the machine. Not a number you can ignore.

As for this experiment you keep referring to, it's commonly known that humans have an energy field -around- them that affect machines as well as other humans. Which would account for the fluxuations on your machine while people were in the room reading.

As already stated, in the experiment Kobok is referring to the subject and machine were in different rooms, if not seperate buildings.

One last time, for good referance, 2,000,000%.

Logged

What sane person could live in this world and not be crazy...

If we are able to step out of what we think is so "obviously" correct, we should.

MachineChimera

Settling In

\*

Posts: 37

Karma: 0

[View Profile](#)

Re: New level of skepticism

« Reply #86 on: July 14, 2006, 03:36:51 PM »

Quote

"You must not be able to comprehend what .500000 means. It means that if say 1,000,000 numbers were generated that there was -no- fluctuation and exactly 50% of the generated numbers were 1's and exactly 50% were 0's. The zero's added after the 5 mean something in case you didn't realize.

It also means that in the numbers generated while the person was trying to change the outcome that out of 1,000,000 numbers there were 20,000 fluctuations.

Hmm, that's odd... that's 2,000,000% more fluctuations than when there was no one concentrating on the machine... but I'm sure we can write that off as mere coincidence.

And keep in mind this isn't an isolated incident like your example of babies being born. This is over a long period of time with someone working towards a specific goal, to produce one's instead of zero's. Which you can plainly see by simple math that while the subject was concentrating there were more 1's than zero's, and not just a small percentage more, there were 2,000,000% more extra one's when the subject was concentrating than there were extra one's when no one was concentrating on the machine. Not a number you can ignore.

As for this experiment you keep referring to, it's commonly known that humans have an energy field -around- them that affect machines as well as other humans. Which would account for the fluctuations on your machine while people were in the room reading.

As already stated, in the experiment Kobok is referring to the subject and machine were in different rooms, if not separate buildings.

One last time, for good reference, 2,000,000%. "

What you don't seem to understand, is that the same experiment has been duplicated, and they got the same sort've 'significant' deviation from the expected chance when people weren't even paying attention. Reading a magazine or book. Daydreaming. No focus or intent whatsoever. Which is rather my point. If the same effect can be achieved in the same manner of 'success' as is being claimed in the experiment Kobok's referring to, then what's at work being the 'phenomena' has nothing to do with psionics or intention. Then again, most such experiments fail outright, so.

Really? So.. if people have energy fields (Yes, it's an electromagnetic field. Kthnx.) that cause this phenomena, then why do many, or MOST, of such tests fail, even when the subject is near the machine? If your conjecture were accurate, then the machine would deviate from the expected EVERY Time an individual were near the RNG. Also,

not the case.

Also, it might be in your best interest to check your math. I'll point you to my latest response to Kobok, reinforcing, and listing yet MORE individuals who are professional statisticians, extremely well educated people in the fields of mathematics, whom are evaluating the same data from the experiment in question, and are not finding a 2,000,000% increase in anything. Kobok mentioned a 4%, so how you got from 4% to 2 million percent more, I don't know. In any event, even Kobok's 4% claim does not hold up to these extremely well educated professionals' scrutiny or statistical review. One last time, for good reference. Cheesy

« Last Edit: July 14, 2006, 03:50:23 PM by MachineChimera »

Logged

Azazen

Regular Member

A Veritas Regular

\*\*

Posts: 87

Karma: 0

Regular Member

[View Profile](#)

Re: New level of skepticm

« Reply #87 on: July 14, 2006, 07:10:23 PM »

I didn't think you would understand. It seems you are incapable of calculating that when something happens 20,000 times the second time and it happend 0 times the first time it is a two million percent increase. Let's break it down for the laymen in this thread (You). If something happens 0 times the first time and 1 time the second time it is a 100% increase. Now multiply that by 20,000. It's very obvious to me now, why you would say that the results are insignificant. All you seem to be able to say is "If it were relevant 'they' wouldn't say it isn't" They being scientists that claim to have looked over the data provided and come to a scientific conclusion.

"Oh no, the scientists of the world say it is flat, you must be an idiot for saying otherwise. Who are you to them anyway? Where are your degree's Christopher Columbus?! I don't have to check anything because those intelligent scientists told me so!"

That seems to be your argument, like a broken record you keep saying "If it were true the scientists wouldn't say it isn't!". Now that we have established that your math is not only flawed but you are unable to understand and calculate simple mathematical concepts I don't think you get to say what math is or isn't wrong here. You should

accept what we say as truth without question. It seems to be what you've done with all of the sceptics, because we all know you're unable to calculate the results yourself.

Logged  
What sane person could live in this world and not be crazy...

If we are able to step out of what we think is so "obviously" correct, we should.

kobok

Veritas Council

Tech Team

Posts By Osmosis

\*\*\*\*\*

Posts: 4747

Karma: 148

Veritas Council

[View Profile](#)

Re: New level of skepticm

« Reply #88 on: July 14, 2006, 09:12:05 PM »

Quote from: MachineChimera on July 14, 2006, 09:37:04 AM

Truly? So then the majority of those practicing and well-reputed in the field of Physics do not have degrees in Physics? And the majority, or even a significant portion, of those practicing in the psychological community, do not have Psychology degrees? Sounds pretty anomalous to me. As to the issue of computer science, that's largely because computers are a relatively new invention, and as such there was nothing to study until their invention. Obviously, a field of study does not crop up before the subject itself of study and use exists. Hardly the case with parapsychology, which's subject has been around for quite a while. Indeed, what other fields of study exist for which there is a specific degree, and we find that the majority of it's professionals do not in fact have that degree?

For crying out loud, did you even read what I wrote before replying? Physics is not interdisciplinary. Computational chemistry, computational neurbiology, biochemistry, etc, and yes, parapsychology, are all interdisciplinary. Parapsychology is an interdisciplinary study between physics, psychology, and statistics. It draws elements, techniques, and researchers from each of these fields. I explained this to you already, but you seem bent on repeating your preconceptions without reading the text that I am typing.

Quote from: MachineChimera on July 14, 2006, 09:37:04 AM

The same standardized techniques commonly used in other fields, and yet after all this time, none of these techniques have yielded solid, inarguable, or even obvious, proof of authenticity?

They have indeed yielded solid and obvious proof of the validity of psi. Unfortunately, nothing is inarguable. People argue because things make them unhappy.

Evolution, similarly, has solid and obvious proof of its validity to the same extent as psi. Yet still, you have around 50% of the U.S. believing evolution is bogus (particularly in your state), and you have creationists constantly making up crap about how the evolutionists are all just fraudulent, are all lying, or are just conducting bad science. You get popular creationist magazines which purport to point out flaws in standard results in evolution science (just like the popular skeptical magazines which do the same), and you get creationists who self-annoint themselves as experts on evolution without having ever actually DONE any work in the science of evolution, who go around telling people how bogus it is (just like the skeptics who self-annoint themselves as experts in parapsychology without ever doing any studies).

So sadly, nothing is inarguable. If your best reason for disbelieving the results of parapsychology is that people argue about it, then you are barking up quite a fallacious tree.

Quote from: MachineChimera on July 14, 2006, 09:37:04 AM

I'll reiterate also that if the results were 'conclusive', 'overwhelming', and 'astronomical' as you earlier described, there wouldn't be all this debate; the evidence would be self-supportive, not subject to numerous qualified ridicules.

I certainly wish that were true. But sadly, humans aren't quite so rational. See above.

Quote from: MachineChimera on July 14, 2006, 09:37:04 AM

Once more, you have the same experience with a few statistics classes, and courses on mathematics, or less, than many of the individuals ridiculing the significance or meaning of the results you cite as successes, yet somehow feel qualified to make judgment that those of disparate opinion are not educated enough, whereas from the same level of education, or less, you somehow were educated enough. Such probably stems from your own belief as to your own intellectual accuity.

Well, you show me precisely what statistical conclusion I have made incorrectly. If you want to debate on a basis of intellectual ability and subject knowledge, we can certainly do so, but we shall do it with facts, not repeated rhetoric.

Quote from: MachineChimera on July 14, 2006, 09:37:04 AM

Indeed, and yet these deviations from the expectation of value, however astronomically small, do occur, and with great frequency, if we again look to Littlewood's Law.

You are grossly misapplying "Littlewood's Law". Littlewood's Law was based on the

premise that in everyday events, the number of "runs" is astronomically high due to the huge variation in "things" that happen, so if you select "any astronomically unlikely event" from the set of all possible things that happen to a person, which is astronomically high, then you will have these events happen on a somewhat regular basis.

What it DOES NOT mean is that astronomically unlikely events happen with more frequency than their probability. So when we have systems with known numbers of runs, astronomical deviations do NOT happen with great frequency.

Any attempt to use this to invalidate the results of controlled psi experiments is a fallacy and indicates a misunderstanding of basic statistics. You should be skeptical of any webpage you have read which uses this argument.

Quote from: MachineChimera on July 14, 2006, 09:37:04 AM

As such, you are not at liberty to point to such an 'astronomically small' chance actually coming to fruition as evidence of a cause for a phenomena that already has explainable causes, unless you can somehow show evidence that the activity you are claiming was the reason such a deviation occurred. That would be valid. You are instead attempting to assert that the deviation's occurrence is proof of the phenomena, which is rather backward. How about you get evidence that the phenomena claimed is causing the occurrence.

The controlled experiments DO provide evidence that the phenomena claimed is causing the occurrence, and do NOT claim that the "presence" of a deviation is the source of this claim. Instead, the experiments rely on the standard and basic principle of "controlled experimentation", which is that if you only vary ONE variable between a control run and an experimental run, namely, the activity of the participant's focus, and there is a statistically significant deviation BETWEEN these two runs, then it indicates that the varied variable CAUSED that change.

This is the identical core principle upon which nearly every psychology and medical study in the last 100 years is based. If you don't believe it, then I'm afraid you don't believe in science.

Quote from: MachineChimera on July 14, 2006, 09:37:04 AM

What's also been quite prominent is that, again, all that hooplah and serious treatment isn't even required; people can be reading magazines, daydreaming, lost in thought, and not at all concentrating or intent upon creating an effect at all, and they continue to happen, when they infrequently do. Obviously, no psychic intent or ability is required for these changes, since they sometimes occur in their absence as easily as in their supposed presence.

No. Again, that is not how controlled experiments are done.

Quote from: MachineChimera on July 14, 2006, 09:37:04 AM



They've indicated several times that conscious effort and focus is not required.

Again, only one variable is varied, and that variable is the conscious effort. Therefore, for significant change, it is the cause of the change. This is the basic premise of controlled research.

Quote from: MachineChimera on July 14, 2006, 09:37:04 AM

I have indeed read it, and find it riddled with the same manner of assertions he is leveling towards detractors in the self-same chapter. He states "wrong" as to the statement that "Despite the endless pronouncements and anecdotes in the popular press, and despite a steady trickle of serious research on such things, there is no significant or trustworthy evidence that such phenomena even exist. The wide gap between popular conviction on this matter, and the actual evidence, is something that itself calls for research. For there is not a single parapsychological effect that can be repeatedly or reliably produced in any laboratory suitably equipped to perform and control the experiment. Not one.", yet makes no backing of it by providing a case list of all the supposedly repeated, reliably produced effects in a suitably equipped and controlled library. If there are 'half a dozen' psi effects as he claims that have met such a standard, he ought to very easily list them, as they seem evidently to be directly and specifically upon his mind at the time, to come up with such an estimation.

He DOES list them in excruciating detail. You read one chapter out of a fairly thick book, most of which is focused on detailing hundreds of studies, the details of their methodologies, the criticisms of those studies, and the replications of those studies, exactly as you say he should do.

Quote from: MachineChimera on July 14, 2006, 09:37:04 AM

There has not been to present ONE repeatable test outcome indicative of something psi related going on that cannot be, using the same data collated, be shown to be a marginal success, or no success at all, dependant upon who's reviewing the data, and by what criteria they're using.

Sure there has. The RNG influence experiments are consistent and are not even close to marginal significance. Their significance is quite astronomical. The Ganzfeld experiments are a sequence of experiments in which a single protocol was used to repeatedly test psi perception.

The only prevailing criticism against the Ganzfeld experiments is that, somehow, magically, there were hundreds or thousands of experiments that people did (no one knows who did them), and no one ever told anybody about, and that these experiments balance out the ones which are reported. If we approached medical studies with that kind of stubborn logic we'd be dying at 60.

Quote from: MachineChimera on July 14, 2006, 09:37:04 AM

Quote

"It IS claimed by intent before it is done. The intent is to try to get as many right as

possible. Would you consider Babe Ruth a fraud if he predicted his batting average for a year would be 0.37, and it were then in fact 0.34? Of course not. Babe Ruth simply went out on the field and tried to hit as many as he could as his "intent".

No, a specific claim is not made. "I will now affect the number of 1's produced by this randomly generating machine." is not a specific claim. It does not at all denote in what manner the subject plans to affect the machine, or in what way.

Sure, "I will now affect the number of 1's produced" does not say what way, but that's not what I said. I said "try to get as many right as possible", which means, "I will now increase the number of 1's produced", which IS a specific AND testable claim. And the test is done correctly.

Quote from: MachineChimera on July 14, 2006, 09:37:04 AM

Quote

"Wrong wrong wrong wrong wrong. Quantum mechanics dictates that quantum mechanical events, such as the decay of particles, and other small atomic fluctuations, ARE dictated purely and fundamentally by chance, and are NOT deterministic in design. Determinism as a rule went out with the days of Newton. And, in fact, quantum mechanical chance events ARE used in some of the random number generators used in psi experiments. This has been a topic of interest in a couple of Foundations of Physics journal articles in the last couple decades."

Arguably, and arguably not, depending upon which side of the fence you're on. Einstein and Bohm for instance, were hidden variables determinists, and they are not alone. To this day, many physicists side with the Bohm interpretation of QM/Bohmian mechanics. Gerard Hooft indeed published in 1999 Quantum Gravity as a Dissipative Deterministic System, pointing out flaws in the present model of non-determinist quantum mechanics. Once more, your belief system and opinion on results, do not make them factual.

His theory makes predictions which are unfortunately wrong. He predicts that there are massless deterministic neutrinos for which operators would remain diagonal. This was contradicted experimentally in 2001, when good measurements of neutrino mass were made, and solar neutrino mixing was measured.

His theory also makes an incorrect computability prediction about quantum versus classical computing, although to be fair, this was published prior to a large mass of papers about quantum computing which came out in the years between 1999 and 2006, so we have the benefit of hindsight on this.

Despite the incorrect predictions of the theory, the real clincher though is that Hooft fails to adequately explain the EPR experiments of the 80's, in which it was demonstrated that hidden variable theories are false. Hooft tries to explain this away by saying there might be some determinism at scales much much smaller than the electron, but that the determinism becomes non-deterministic at the scale of subatomic particles, and thus,

explaining the EPR experiments. This fails on the basic definition of deterministic, and he does not demonstrate this except to say that no equation exists.

This is why Hooft's paper has not become accepted physics knowledge. And thus we are left with the conclusion that the universe is not deterministic, as it says in essentially every modern physics textbook which addresses the topic.

Quote from: MachineChimera on July 14, 2006, 09:37:04 AM

Quote

"Name Radin's hypothesis. Before you can claim that he has data which does not fit his hypothesis, you must first specify precisely what Radin's hypothesis was. So go ahead and do that."

So far as his graphical data, and the book at large go, his hypothesis seems to be that when many people are focused on one thing, it influences stochastic processes. Done.

Not quite. That is a generalization of his hypothesis. The hypothesis for an experiment must be specific, and his were. For two experiments of this type that I have data sitting in front of me for, the 1995 Academy Awards experiment had a hypothesis that measurements of order in isolated random number generators would be significantly higher during pre-marked time periods of high interest (such as when awards were announced) than during per-marked time periods of low interest (such as when commercials were on). This succeeded with odds of several hundred to one.

For the O.J. Simpson Verdict, the hypothesis was, and I quote, "We expected that the unusual degree of mass attention focused on this event would cause the combined output of five independent RNGs simultaneously to show unexpected order when the verdict was announced." This also succeeded with odds of several hundred to one. It is indeed true that at the very start of the O.J. Simpson Verdict preshow broadcast, the order also rose very high, but this was outside of the initial hypothesis.

Since you slipped in "the book at large" into your previous comment, I deduce that you misunderstand the content of "The Conscious Universe". The particular experiments in question which we are discussing are called "Field Consciousness" experiments (although they may be renamed at some point in the next decade or so as research continues and understanding increases, since they are fairly new). And it should be noted that this type of experiment only occupies 1 chapter out of 17 chapters of The Conscious Universe (or 18 out of 362 pages), because the focus of the book is not supposed to be on this type of experiment. It is supposed to be an overview of all existing parapsychology work prior to the publication date of 1997. The field consciousness studies are simply included as an example of recent results which are intriguing but not thoroughly understood. If some reviewer presented them to you as representative of the contents of that book, then that reviewer misled you, as one could note by opening the book at least as far as the table of contents.

You may notice that I neglected to respond to some portions of your previous posts. I provide you with a statement from a statistics professor who specializes in research design, you provide me with a statement from a guy who got a masters in mathematics. I provide you with a Nobel laureate in physics, you provide me with a retired astrophysicist. We could go back and forth with argument from authority for quite some time, and it would remain as fallacious as the day we start. I think it is far more prudent to discuss experimental fact if your wish is also to discern the truth.

Quote from: MachineChimera on July 14, 2006, 03:36:51 PM

What you don't seem to understand, is that the same experiment has been duplicated, and they got the same sort've 'significant' deviation from the expected chance when people weren't even paying attention.

Now that I've explained the form of a controlled experiment, perhaps you can see how this is not a legitimate objection. What you are saying is that someone, somewhere, once tried to replicate a psi experiment, but they were getting significant deviations from chance during their control run as well as their experimental run. This says that this group which attempted to replicate it did not have a true random number generator. They purchased or constructed a defective piece of hardware which was not random, and thus, they always received deviations from chance. This does not invalidate studies which DID use true random number generators, and DID see deviations from chance in the experimental runs which were significantly different from the deviations during the control runs. Their experimental designs, being "controlled", already explicitly tested for the problem the group you mentioned was having.

« Last Edit: July 14, 2006, 09:30:51 PM by kobok »      Logged

MachineChimera

Settling In

\*

Posts: 37

Karma: 0

[View Profile](#)

Re: New level of skepticism

« Reply #89 on: July 15, 2006, 04:55:10 AM »

Quote

"I didn't think you would understand. It seems you are incapable of calculating that when something happens 20,000 times the second time and it happened 0 times the first time it is a two million percent increase. Let's break it down for the laymen in this thread (You). If something happens 0 times the first time and 1 time the second time it is a 100% increase. Now multiply that by 20,000. It's very obvious to me now, why you would say that the results are insignificant. All you seem to be able to say is "If it were relevant 'they' wouldn't say it isn't" They being scientists that claim to have looked over the data provided and come to a scientific conclusion.

"Oh no, the scientists of the world say it is flat, you must be an idiot for saying otherwise. Who are you to them anyway? Where are your degree's Christopher Columbus?! I don't have to check anything because those intelligent scientists told me so!"

That seems to be your argument, like a broken record you keep saying "If it were true the scientists wouldn't say it isn't!". Now that we have established that your math is not only flawed but you are unable to understand and calculate simple mathematical concepts I don't think you get to say what math is or isn't wrong here. You should accept what we say as truth without question. It seems to be what you've done with all of the sceptics, because we all know you're unable to calculate the results yourself."

The -best- part here, is that you don't understand the fundamental tenants of mathematics at work here, and are seeking to assert ignorance on my part of same. Obviously, you don't understand statistics at all, and neither understand how to read significance. An occurrence of 1 deviation outside the expected, statistical zero is not a significant "100%" percent increase, in the scope of the thousands of times 1's and 0's are being generated. There are, in fact, a mathematically/statistically expected number of deviations away from statistical expectation of exactly the same number of 1's and 0's (And in fact, I seriously doubt your claim that the machine ran exactly the same number of 1's and 0's, to come out exactly to 50/50 split, any of the times it ran. That said, -do-link to where you ascertained that to be the case, if you're not just running off at the mouth in an attempt to appear knowledgeable and high-handed.). So, each "1" that occurred out of say, 1,000 runs, above the expected number, was not a large chunk increase in occurrence or deviation. Most of them, and as many mathematicians/statisticians are saying in review of data, ALL of them, ran well within the statistically acceptable realm of what will, by random chance alone, range in the scope of deviations from statistical expected.

And since we seem to be on the topic of comprehension, it's exceedingly evident that you are incapable of gleaning the meaning from large blocks of words put before you. This is the sort've generic, useful literacy skill that woefully, in escaping you, will hinder your ability to appear intelligent when spouting your GGKKKbbq1 kthnx! internet psiclaims. My litany is not that extremely well educated individuals that make a living doing what is claimed in this situation as being evidence of psychic activity, review the data and find no evidence at all of same. The issue is not "OMG they said it is teh not tru3, so it's not!", it is that there is nothing 'true' here to be disputed, because there is STILL no proof, or even reliable evidence. You're essentially trying to back one horse, and ignore the 80 other horses running past it. Convenient. You'll take the word of one statistician as to the validity of the work, but her partner on the same project who is equally as qualified, sees nothing valid in it, and you ignore it. Other scientists step forward and similarly see no validity, or point out numerous faults in her conclusions and data assembly, and you ignore them too. Unfortunately for you, you don't get to cite evidence that supports, and ignore evidence to the contrary.

Lol. "2 million percent" deviation, indeed.

« Last Edit: July 15, 2006, 05:15:29 AM by MachineChimera »

Logged

Pages: 1 ... 4 5 [6] 7 8 9    Print

« previous next »

Jump to:

=> Main Hall

Powered by MySQL Powered by PHP    Powered by SMF 1.1.18 | SMF © 2013, Simple Machines

Oxygen design by Bloc    Valid XHTML 1.0! Valid CSS!

<http://forums.v society.net/index.php/topic%2C8667.105.html>

1 capture

30 Apr 2013

Mar   APR   May

30

2012   2013   2014

About this capture

The Veritas Society

\*

\*HomeForumsChatHelpSearchRetroLoginRegister

Welcome, Guest. Please login or register.

Did you miss your activation email?

April 30, 2013, 11:35:27 AM

Forever

Login with username, password and session length

Search:

Advanced search

207355 Posts in 14734 Topics by 18410 Members - Latest Member: - MindDisciple

Most online today: 98 - most online ever: 430 (June 28, 2007, 02:58:51 PM)

+   The Veritas Society

| -+   The Auditorium

|| -+   Main Hall

|| | -+   New level of skepticism    0 Members and 1 Guest are viewing this topic. «

previous next »

Pages: 1 ... 6 7 [8] 9 Print

Author    Topic: New level of skepticism    (Read 15098 times)

kobok

Veritas Council

Tech Team  
Posts By Osmosis

\*\*\*\*\*

Posts: 4743  
Karma: 148

Veritas Council

[View Profile](#)

Re: New level of skepticm

« Reply #105 on: July 18, 2006, 02:57:28 AM »

MachineChimera, the volume of your text is somewhat redundant in its content. I will attempt to reply only to each point once. Please try to constrain your comments to the points you believe are most relevant so that the length of these posts does not balloon out of reasonable manageability.

Quote from: MachineChimera on July 17, 2006, 10:53:46 AM

Quote

"Again, we do not need to turn to silly arguments from authority for this. We can, in fact, calculate the deviation from chance exactly using trivial formulas. Square root the integral for the second moment over the interval in question, and you obtain the standard deviation. Fortunately, in this case, it reduces to the very trivial formula"

We could in fact, if you could get the two sides to agree on what exactly constitutes the data to feed into the calculations, which, as is evident to anyone reading the thread thusfar, is the source of contention, not the tried and tested formulas involved. An excellent attempt on your part however to drag the attention to a solid formula, and away from the actual issue of invalid data being ran through it to yield results.

I focused carefully on explaining the formulas to you because you demonstrated in your earlier posts that you misunderstood the key concepts demonstrated by these formulas. You argued several times that the magnitude of an effect determined its likelihood to occur by chance, when this is not the case. I hope we are clear on this point now, as that was my intention for explaining the statistics carefully.

Quote from: MachineChimera on July 17, 2006, 10:53:46 AM

Quote

"So yes, your dismissal of results of this magnitude as insignificant is a statistical error on your part. In fact, it is a statistical error on the part of anyone, no matter what their education, who claims the results are statistically insignificant."

Again, I'll sit in humor while you attempt to assert that anyone, no matter how much more education and knowledge they have with any of the subjects you've used to arrive at your distorted perception of psi's validity, is wrong, if they disagree with you, while those educated figures you've dropped (in tandem to their credentials it might be noted, while in the same moments feeling free to turn about and attempt arguing that someone's education or qualifications isn't important. Hm.) that do agree with your take on the issue, are all qualified and relevant experts to submit.

If they disagree with the basic statistical concept that I showed above, then yes, they are wrong, regardless of their qualifications. This does not require rhetorical rewording.

Quote from: MachineChimera on July 17, 2006, 10:53:46 AM

Since you're talking about putting the cart before the horse, let's put your own cart behind it's conveyance, and address that the results of such testing would be proof, if any of them actually did turn out conclusively and inarguably to be supportive of actual deviations from chance, would be evidence that something is occurring between the person and the machine, and not evidence of anything in specific being that cause, until you can determine how the results are coming about.

If we modulate only one variable, the focused intention of the participant, with nothing else changing, and the results fluctuate accordingly, then by the principles of controlled experimentation this is the cause. Understanding the mechanism is not required to draw this conclusion.

Similarly, if in a controlled experiment I leave one piece of cheese on the kitchen counter, and another piece of cheese in the fridge, and the one on the kitchen counter becomes fuzzy faster with repeatability, then I know that cheese becomes fuzzy faster outside of the fridge than inside of it. I do not need to know anything about the enzymes and mechanisms within mold to deduce that this effect is true given the observations of a controlled experiment.

Quote from: MachineChimera on July 17, 2006, 10:53:46 AM

I.e., what's causing them. Do tell me, what is the parapsychological assertion at present as to how psi works? Is it a wave function coming from the brain? How does it affect the generation of 1's and 0's? Tell us what exactly we should be looking for, to say conclusively that yes, this is in fact Psi, causing this deviation.

The only available conclusion within parapsychology is that at this time there is no physical mechanism to look for. There is no electromagnetic mediation, no known particle mediation, and no known quantum mechanical method for classical information transfer at a distance. In fact, it can be concluded that all known mechanisms within known physics cannot explain the results of psi experiments. If this is philosophically discomforting for you to not know how something works, then I apologize. But that is the result.

If you are genuinely interested in discussing my personal theories for the mechanism of



operation, then we can do this. But this is not a parapsychological observation. It is key that we keep clear that these are different categories of things. So if you want to discuss them, it should be for the sole purpose of your own curiosity about my theories for the mechanism of operation. If not, we shall simply move on to another topic.

Quote from: MachineChimera on July 17, 2006, 10:53:46 AM

If I have the winning lotto ticket in a billion to one drawing, and I win, I cannot freely make up what exactly caused me to win, and say that my winning is evidence of that cause's veracity.

You are confusing a controlled experiment with a self-selected sample. These are completely different phenomena within statistics, and must be addressed entirely differently.

Quote from: MachineChimera on July 17, 2006, 10:53:46 AM

And yes, you can change SOME tester's IQ scoring. You cannot change many of the testers by such estimations.

It is incorrect to categorize this as an isolated effect. However, my psychology textbook on motivation is at the office, so I do not have the reference on hand for the studies which demonstrate this.

Quote from: MachineChimera on July 17, 2006, 10:53:46 AM

Where is the critical thinking and research on your Constructs, I wonder?

They are a technique which yields results. For your purposes, you can think of this like you would think of a basketball player who visualizes his shots before attempting a basket. You cannot directly observe him doing the visualization, but you can observe the effects. If the effect is that when he visualizes he succeeds better, then this is a good technique for him to use. To my knowledge, there are no controlled double-blind studies on constructs or on basketball players visualizing baskets. However, both are still used as techniques simply because they are found to be effective by the ones who take part in these respective activities.

Quote from: MachineChimera on July 17, 2006, 10:53:46 AM

Quote

"Uhhh... What do you not understand about what I just said? Is it that you don't believe me that this is how controlled experiments are done?"

Again, an excellent attempt to divert attention from what's being contested, to something that is already accepted fact, and not at issue at all. I'll reiterate for your benefit, since you didn't seem to understand my response the first time around. Your controls led to what you interpret as successes, and the same successess were achieved without the control that was necessary in the "successssful" tests. If you assert that psi phenomena can happen, and happens by concentrating on the outcome for a desired effect.. and someone else replicates statistical deviation from chance, without concentration, then

obviously concentration isn't needed. This means A) you think Psi happens regardless of your attempt to employ it or not/sans conscious intent, or B) psi wasn't responsible for the successes. This is, again, where asserting some theory as to how psi behaves and is expressed/works, would actually let you link a result to psi as it's origin.

Your conclusion does not logically follow from your premise. Allow me to write it out explicitly:

Experimental Setup #1:

Control run with large N: Within expected deviation from chance.

Experimental run with large N, with participant intent as the only variable changed:  
Far outside of expected deviation from chance.

Experimental Setup #2:

Control run with large N: Far outside of expected deviation from chance.

Experimental run with large N, with participant intent as the only variable changed:  
Far outside of expected deviation from chance.

Now, you are trying to tell us to deduce from this that Experiment #1's results are invalid. This conclusion does not logically follow from the information given. Experiment #1 has only one variable changed from the Control run and the Experimental run, and by changing only this one variable, the participant intent, a largely significant deviation results in the measurement. The setup in experiment #2 is faulty from the beginning, because the control run is invalid. This indicates a strong probability that experiment #2 is utilizing faulty hardware if its RNG is ALWAYS yielding non-chance results.

As I explained, for RNG experiments, a preliminary control run is usually done when a setup is first created to ensure that the RNG is actually random. This is a standard sanity check to make sure your equipment is working before you even think about conducting an experiment. If someone's setup fails the equipment check, then they are not ready to do an experiment.

And once this is done, "results" in a controlled experiment are entirely based on the differences between the experimental run and the control run. Because of this, the evaluation of each experiment can in principle be done completely independently of other experiments and setups. The presence of a control run of significant length, and the protocol of results being a comparison between the experimental and the control run, mean that when only one variable is altered between the two conditions, and a significant result is obtained, then a causal relationship has been demonstrated.

Quote from: MachineChimera on July 17, 2006, 10:53:46 AM

More one-sided, in that you, and Radin, rather comically attempt to claim the evidence is overwhelming and conclusive, and I have already provided link after link and quote after quote, and will provide further, as to that it is anything BUT conclusive, or overwhelming, but is rather still being hotly contested. Maybe you're not sure what

those words actually mean?

I've never once claimed that the evidence is uncontested. In fact, I've said it IS contested. But it is also overwhelming and conclusive. The overwhelmingness and conclusivity of evidence are purely a measure of its intrinsic scientific strength. For evidence to be uncontested, it must be unquestioned. Sadly, the latter does not follow from the former when cherished philosophies are involved.

You have demonstrated for us a propensity for arguing against a point, even when faced with a blatantly obvious scan of a page which shows one thing when you are saying it shows another. How can we expect that scientific evidence will be given a fairer shake than an image right before your eyes? Clearly contention has nothing to do with truth for many.

Quote from: MachineChimera on July 17, 2006, 10:53:46 AM

Quote

"When skeptical researchers and researchers who believe give their participants different instructions in different tones, then yes, results differ. But that is not repetition, that is changing a key aspect of the experiment. Skeptics who participate in studies while a researcher who believes instructs the participants have found positive results. In addition, studies in which a computer instructs and interacts with the participant have also found positive results."

Quite so: tone and interaction does have a rather large impact on the outcome of results, and you're quite right, that is changing a key aspect of the experiment: For successes to occur, the researcher is generally someone that believes in the existence of psi! Miraculously, when the researcher Doesn't, evidence fails to come up.

This seems to have much less to do with the researcher's beliefs than with the researcher's handling of participants. What is quite well documented is that the expectations of participants enormously change their ability to do psi. If participants believe they will fail, the results are very weak or negative. If participants believe they will succeed, the results are generally strong or positive. This can and has been well-established using two-tailed test. (The two-tailed test raises the required threshold for statistical significance to allow analysis of variables that can go in two directions.)

Quote from: MachineChimera on July 17, 2006, 10:53:46 AM

As to the computer studies, please provide link or book source to the studies in question? I actually would pull that book from the library, if it's out there, showing repeated successes in a controlled environment that didn't involve a human researcher predisposed to belief, or to desire successful results.

I look forward to hearing your conclusions after reading the following information. I will attempt to place the auto-ganzfeld references I have available in chronological order:

Honorton, C., and E. I. Schechter. 1987. Ganzfeld target retrieval with an automated

testing system: A model for initial ganzfeld success. In *Research in Parapsychology* 1986, edited by D. B. Weiner and R. D. Nelson, 36-39

Broughton, R. S., H. Kanthamani, and A. Khilji. 1990. Assessing the PRL success model on an independent ganzfeld data base. In *Research in Parapsychology* 1989, edited by L. Henkel and J. Palmer, 32-35.

Honorton, C., R. E. Berger, M. P. Varvoglis, M. Quant, P. Derr, E. I. Schechter, and D. C. Ferrari. 1990. Psi communication in the ganzfeld: Experiments with an automated testing system and a comparison with a meta-analysis of earlier studies. *Journal of Parapsychology* 54:99-139.

Schlitz, M. J., and C. Honorton. 1992. Ganzfeld psi performance within an artistically gifted population. *Journal of the American Society for Psychical Research* 86:83-98

Radin, D. I. 1993. The Video Ganzfeld System. Technical Report, Koestler Chair of Parapsychology, Dept. of Psychology, Univ. of Edinburgh.

Bem, D. J., and C. Honorton. 1994: Does psi exist? Replicable evidence for an anomalous process of information transfer. *Psychological Bulletin* 115:4-18

Wezelman, R., and J. L. F. Gerding. 1994. The set-effect analysis: A post hoc analysis of displacement in Utrecht ganzfeld-data. In *Proceedings of Presented Papers, 37th Annual Parapsychological Association Convention*.

Bierman, D. J. 1995. The Amsterdam Ganzfeld Series III and IV: Target clip emotionality, effect sizes and openness. In *Proceedings of Presented Papers, 38th Annual Parapsychological Association Convention*.

Broughton, R. S., and C. Alexander. 1995. Autoganzfeld II: The first 100 sessions. In *Proceedings of Presented Papers, 38th Annual Parapsychological Association Convention*.

Dalton, K. S., R. L. Morris, D. Delanoy, D. I. Radin, and R. Wiseman. 1996. Security measures in an automated ganzfeld system. *Journal of Parapsychology* 60 (2): 120-148

Morris, R. L., K. Dalton, D. Delanoy, and C. Watt. 1995. Comparison of the sender/no sender condition in the ganzfeld. In *Proceedings of Presented Papers, 38th Annual Parapsychology Association Convention*.

Parker, A., A. Frederiksen, and H. Johansson. 1997. Towards specifying the recipe for success with the ganzfeld: Replication of the ganzfeld findings using a manual ganzfeld with subjects reporting subjective paranormal experiences. *European Journal of Parapsychology* 16

Wezelman, R., J. L. F. Gerding, and I. Verhoeven. 1997. Eigensender ganzfeld psi: An experiment in practical philosophy. *European Journal of Parapsychology*, 13, 28-39.

Quote from: MachineChimera on July 17, 2006, 10:53:46 AM

1)-In both the Ganzfeld and AutoGanzfeld, not all the rooms where tests were conducted had sound-proof rooms, potential sensory leakage.

Find a scholarly publication documenting this, including a description of exactly which lab had this problem.

Quote from: MachineChimera on July 17, 2006, 10:53:46 AM

2)The experimenter working with the receiver or the receiver herself "may detect creases, marks, smudges, temperature differences or other artifacts that result if actual targets have been handled and then mixed in with targets from a pool for judging. Handling cues may also result when targets placed in envelopes are opened and then resealed or placed in new envelopes, as has sometimes been done. Ideally, two sets of targets should be used, one handled by the sender and the other given to the receiver for review. 64% of the studies did not use duplicate target sets of pictures for the "Sending the Target" phase of the testing.

This criticism was made obsolete by the separate sets of videos being computer controlled in the autoganzfeld studies, and the observed effect remained consistent.

Quote from: MachineChimera on July 17, 2006, 10:53:46 AM

...In 1981 or 1982, Honorton sent all the reported studies to Hyman who proceeded to do a meta-analysis of them. Hyman concluded that the data did not warrant belief in psi, primarily because of many flaws he found in the experiments themselves. He found three types of flaws: 1- security flaws (sensory leakage; information could have been transferred by experimenters to receivers by talking in the hallway or inadvertently communicating information during the judging phase); 2- statistical flaws; and 3- procedural flaws (randomization problems; documentation problems). He rejected twenty studies as being fatally flawed. That amounted to about half the database. He stripped the data down to twenty-two studies by eight investigators and 746 trials, which accounted for 48% of the data base.

You neglected the most important part of this... Even after Hyman removed the 20 studies he was skeptical of, and kept only the 28 he did like, the odds against chance using only those 28 studies were THEN ten billion to one.

So even when Hyman removed everything he could find to be critical of, the results were still overwhelming. (The autoganzfeld was then formulated to remove the criticisms that came up during this analysis.)

Quote from: MachineChimera on July 17, 2006, 10:53:46 AM

5)"analyses of what I did get uncovered some peculiar and strong patterns in the data.

All of the significant hitting was done on the second or later appearance of a target. If we examined the guesses against just the first occurrences of targets, the result is consistent with chance. Moreover, the hit rate rose systematically with each additional occurrence of a target.

What you should expect is that participants get better at the task as they receive practice. This is sensible, and it has been observed in ganzfeld experiments and elsewhere that when participants receive feedback telling them whether or not they were right (as occurs in ganzfeld experiments), their subsequent scores improve. This effect can easily result in the correlation described.

Quote from: MachineChimera on July 17, 2006, 10:53:46 AM

6)Despite Radin's claim of successs against the odds in excess of a trillion to one, Andrew Endersby writes "At the end of my research I find a hit rate of between 28.6% and 28.9% depending on certain choices concerning which scoring methods to use on particular experiments. This doesn't have quite the headline grabbing appeal of 1 in 3 instead of 1 in 4 but the hit rate is still highly significant for 6,700 sessions. However, this contains all experiments. Flawed or not, standard or not. ... (Once more, we have at issue the data being fed into the formula in order to create the illusion of 'success' or statistical, whopping deviation, when none is actually present. I suppose it's easy to create a success when you get to pick which experiment results go into the meta-analysis, huh?)

His results were ALSO "highly significant", by his own words, entirely of their own accord.

Regarding which data is included in meta-analyses, that depends on the format of the experiment. When examining strict replication of the autoganzfeld, those doing a meta-analysis only accept experiments which follow the format strictly, and exclude those who attempt new deviations. The deviations from the original format have value in that they are trying something new, but they are not precise replications.

Quote from: MachineChimera on July 17, 2006, 10:53:46 AM

10)"In 1987, Dean Radin and Nelson did a meta-analysis of all RNG experiments done between 1959 and 1987 and found that they produced odds against chance beyond a trillion to one (Radin 1997: 140). This sounds impressive, but as Radin says "in terms of a 50% hit rate, the overall experimental effect, calculated per study, was about 51 percent, where 50 percent would be expected by chance" [emphasis added] (141). A couple of sentences later, Radin gives a more precise rendering of "about 51 percent" by noting that the overall effect was "just under 51 percent." Similar results were found with experiments where people tried to use their minds to affect the outcome of rolls of the dice, according to Radin. And, when Nelson did his own analysis of all the PEAR data (1,262 experiments involving 108 people), he found similar results to the earlier RNG studies but "with odds against chance of four thousand to one" (Radin 1997: 143).

Your point? When you include "all" the data for a real effect, it is quite sensible that the odds are much higher than simply including a subset of the data (the PEAR data). The results are similar, meaning the effect sizes were consistent, but with more runs, the odds that it is measuring a non-chance effect improve, just like in the statistical formula I provided at the top of my previous post.

Quote from: MachineChimera on July 17, 2006, 10:53:46 AM

Quote

"Are you reading what I'm writing before replying? The part that doesn't say which way is YOUR text. The part I stated DOES specific which way."

Are you reading what I'm writing before replying? Or do you not understand the meaning in text? I'll simplify for you. Stating what will happen, is not stating which way/how it will happen. Saying "I will make more 1's than is usual by natural occurrence" is stating what you claim will happen. It does not state how, in which way, or to what degree. It is as vague as saying "I will get food from the store." It says nothing about what food, how much, or how you will arrive there to get it.

By that logic, saying that you will try to make as many baskets as you can in a game of basketball has no meaning.

Quote from: MachineChimera on July 17, 2006, 10:53:46 AM

if I get an insignificant number of 6's in a roll, but I get such insignificant numbers over the course of a long enough duration as to indicate some statistical significance above chance, as would be the case if I got just 1 six above normal in enough rolls, it would not be significant statistically. When the same thing happens with the number of 1's in an RNG, it's different. When critics point out the number of 1's generated was not much above the normal, Utts, Radin, and people like you claim it is, because of the number of such insignificant successes above chance over the course of the tests.

I have no idea what you are trying to say here.

But if you really want to understand, roll that six-sided dice of yours 10,000 times, really high, and make sure it loops at least 6 or 7 times each throw. If you get more than 1720 or so fours, then you should be outrageously surprised. Feel free to try this several times.

Quote from: MachineChimera on July 17, 2006, 10:53:46 AM

Quote

"Quoting Einstein about quantum mechanics won't be very successful, because he is widely regarded to have been quite wrong about it. His contribution to pointing out that the EPR test was there to be made was a stroke of genius, but his assumptions about the result which would be obtained were quite wrong."

His assumption that something IS wrong however is not quite wrong, and is still being

sought after by some of the best minds in the fields today. Hawkings, the predominant theoretical physicist of our times, and one of the most well known/famous, agreed with him on many things, including his "assumptions" about gravity in several aspects. Not that it's relevant: EPR is not at all meaningful in the context of Determinism's truth, any more than you'd site the numerous, overwhelming, conclusive (all actually appropriately used, in this case, it might be noted) frauds and failures in psychic tests thusfar as evidence that Psi does not exist.

Uh... Einstein's famous quote about quantum mechanics and determinism is "God does not play dice with the universe". Hawking's famous quote in response to this is "Not only does God play dice, but... he sometimes throws them where they cannot be seen." So even Hawking is convinced, as are most modern physicists, that the world is non-deterministic based on the weight of evidence. If Einstein had lived long enough to see the current state of evidence, he would probably concur as well.

Quote from: MachineChimera on July 17, 2006, 10:53:46 AM

Quote

"Not really. If I instruct my computer to use /dev/random as an input, and if we consider that /dev/random utilizes such microthermal fluctuations inside the computer that these are occasionally influenced by quantum processes, and I instruct my computer to fire a bullet based on the result of /dev/random, then whether or not that bullet will fire is non-deterministic. There is no amount of knowledge, practically or theoretically, that you can obtain about the state of the computer which will allow you to deduce whether or not that bullet will fire."

A lack of present knowledge does not constitute absolute veracity of present knowledge. History is exemplary in demonstration of this actuality. Not understanding however, is not grounds for creating an explanation to suit you, such as that no amount of knowledge could be obtained to deduce the outcome of a seemingly probabalistic event.

In quantum mechanics, this rule no longer applies. By the rules of quantum mechanics, the presence of knowledge itself about a system causes its state to change, so this results in a fundamental inability to determine the state of a system. It is not simply an ignorance of how to determine the state, but a consequence of the effect of having that knowledge. This is somewhat counter-intuitive and violates the reasoning we use in the classical world, but hey, that's what quantum mechanics is like.

Quote from: MachineChimera on July 17, 2006, 10:53:46 AM

Quote

Quote from: The Conscious Universe

The graph indicates that around the time that the TV preshow began, at 9:00 A.M. Pacific Time, an unexpected degree of order appeared in all of the RNGs. This soon declined back to random behavior until about 10:00 A.M., which is when the verdict was supposed to be announced. A few minutes later, the order in all five RNGs suddenly peaked to its highest point in the two hours of recorded data precisely when the court



clerk read the verdict.  
(emphasis mine)

Now, the critic here is calling Radin a liar and claiming that he altered his data, because the critic has taken "about 10:00 A.M." and turned it into "at 10:00 A.M.", and is then complaining that the first peak is not at exactly 10:00 A.M. How ridiculous is that? You are hinging your objection to Radin on the basis of someone who failed to accurately read the text regarding the critical point of his complaint."

After my mirth subsided, I tried to look seriously at that last of yours, but I can't seem to imagine how you'd type it with a straight face. First off, how scientific and rigorous an analysis did Radin do, if he put specific times on his graph, but goes with "About 10:00"am. Secondly, he specifically states A few minutes later, the order in all five RNGs suddenly peaked to its highest point in the two hours of recorded data. What's a few minutes later than 10:00 am? Because the graph shows at that by 10:02 the graph of activity in the RNG spikes had already begun their rapid drop-off. Obviously it was not "a few minutes later" than 10am, as he'd attempt to mislead the readers. It was either 10:01, or the spikes happened before the verdict was read.

You really want to defend that point?

I will simply post the image of the page for anyone reading along to judge for themselves.

(Anyone wishing to read the entire chapter should consider buying it. It is worth the price for anyone interested enough to read through the oversized volume which has become this thread.)

Quote from: MachineChimera on July 17, 2006, 10:53:46 AM  
Quote

"I think you're mistaken. The autoganzfeld experiments, by definition of being "auto", were controlled entirely by computer. The experimenter was not even in the soundproof room with the subject, and the subject was being prompted by an automated computer. Over 354 sessions in this form, the hit rate was 34% (with chance of 25%), yielding odds against chance of 45000 to 1."

Another excellent attempt at misleading: the displaying of images, the orders of test material presentation, etc, were entirely automated by computer. The judging of results after the subjects did their guesswork with the judges themselves, was entirely not automated.

You are obviously mistaken, because there are not even any "judges" for the participants to work with in the standard ganzfeld or autoganzfeld experiments. I suggest you check your source of information more carefully, or, consult the journal articles given above and get the information from the horse's mouth.

Quote from: MachineChimera on July 17, 2006, 10:53:46 AM

Quote

"Again, this is not only a stupid comment, but a blind one. The graph on page 181 has a point directly on the day of the full moon, and in fact, has the same density of data points around the full moon as elsewhere. You'd have to be completely blind to miss this. The line between data points is not connected between the full moon point and the following data point, but this is because the data collection began and stopped around the full moon (remember of course, the lunar cycle is cyclic)."

That's one way of looking at it. Another way is that, had he included a line between the data points, connected between the full moon point and the following data point, it might demonstrate a pattern of activity not consistent with his attempt to show the influence of the moon and the activity spikes in question.

Your comment is nonsensical. Look at the image I scanned and provided in my previous post, and try to figure out what pattern would be destroyed by connecting the two unconnected points with a straight line...

« Last Edit: July 18, 2006, 03:09:42 AM by kobok »      Logged

MachineChimera

Settling In

\*

Posts: 37

Karma: 0

[View Profile](#)

Re: New level of skepticism

« Reply #106 on: July 19, 2006, 12:00:18 PM »

Quote

"I focused carefully on explaining the formulas to you because you demonstrated in your earlier posts that you misunderstood the key concepts demonstrated by these formulas. You argued several times that the magnitude of an effect determined its likelihood to occur by chance, when this is not the case. I hope we are clear on this point now, as that was my intention for explaining the statistics carefully."

I argued no such thing. Further, there has been no point during this discussion at which I've brought to challenge the veracity of any of the formulas mentioned thusfar.

Quote

"If they disagree with the basic statistical concept that I showed above, then yes, they are wrong, regardless of their qualifications. This does not require rhetorical rewording."

No, it does not. What it does require is a dash of critical thinking: you deciding that

those who do not agree with your opinion are wrong, is fallacious in the extreme. None of the skeptics quoted or referenced thusfar have questioned the formulas used to derive the claimed success rates, only (as I've repeated over, and over, and over again) the methods and selectivity involved in the data being considered, or omitted, respectively.

#### Quote

"If we modulate only one variable, the focused intention of the participant, with nothing else changing, and the results fluctuate accordingly, then by the principles of controlled experimentation this is the cause. Understanding the mechanism is not required to draw this conclusion.

Similarly, if in a controlled experiment I leave one piece of cheese on the kitchen counter, and another piece of cheese in the fridge, and the one on the kitchen counter becomes fuzzy faster with repeatability, then I know that cheese becomes fuzzy faster outside of the fridge than inside of it. I do not need to know anything about the enzymes and mechanisms within mold to deduce that this effect is true given the observations of a controlled experiment."

An apt analogy for the issue, and especially helpful for my case. If the modulate the variable of the cheese being outside of the fridge by leaving it in, and it aged as quickly as the cheese left outside, the hypothesis that the cheese molds/ages faster depending upon the temperature of it's surroundings would be unverified. You get the same results in the warm surroundings, as in the chilled/fridge. Just so; when you arrive at the same deviation from chance expectation without concentration, as you did with, it's indicative that concentration is not required for the phenomena that's causing the deviation of chance to occur. If one is asserting that psychic abilities, which require intent/concentration/focus, are behind the results, and the same results are achieved without said intent/concentration/focus, it rather indicates that psychic powers are not responsible.

#### Quote

"The only available conclusion within parapsychology is that at this time there is no physical mechanism to look for. There is no electromagnetic mediation, no known particle mediation, and no known quantum mechanical method for classical information transfer at a distance. In fact, it can be concluded that all known mechanisms within known physics cannot explain the results of psi experiments. If this is philosophically discomforting for you to not know how something works, then I apologize. But that is the result.

If you are genuinely interested in discussing my personal theories for the mechanism of operation, then we can do this. But this is not a parapsychological observation. It is key that we keep clear that these are different categories of things. So if you want to discuss them, it should be for the sole purpose of your own curiosity about my theories for the mechanism of operation. If not, we shall simply move on to another topic."

Yet again we see the pattern you and those like you employ; attempting to pass off as facts or certainties, your own conclusions. That is not "the result." The result is a lack of explanation for the results at present, not that they are psychic in nature. Indeed, without providing any basis for how psi behaves, or how psi should be evident, you can no more conclude that your make-believe 'psi' powers are the cause, as any other unknown interaction. Your argument that psi is responsible is as valid and evident as that magical entities that exist between time and space are interacting with the RNGs, or that the weather conditions outside are somehow related to the outcomes: have weather phenomena been studied and contrasted to the data testing patterns? Sounds ridiculous, huh? Yeah. It does to me too.

Quote

"You are confusing a controlled experiment with a self-selected sample. These are completely different phenomena within statistics, and must be addressed entirely differently."

Oh? So then let's expand it beyond self-selected sample. Let's consider every single person that's ever won the lottery, and the astronomical odds against them. Let's calculate their combined success rate of 'beating chance' by winning the lottery from the time lottery tickets began sales, to present. Now, let's point to the deviation, and then freely create a fantastical explanation for the apparent, unexplainable deviation from expected chance that's occurred. Those damn magical entities between space and time, up to their old tricks again.

Quote

"They are a technique which yields results. For your purposes, you can think of this like you would think of a basketball player who visualizes his shots before attempting a basket. You cannot directly observe him doing the visualization, but you can observe the effects. If the effect is that when he visualizes he succeeds better, then this is a good technique for him to use. To my knowledge, there are no controlled double-blind studies on constructs or on basketball players visualizing baskets. However, both are still used as techniques simply because they are found to be effective by the ones who take part in these respective activities."

Indeed, purely conceptual, and not reflective of actual reality: there are no real constructs running around imbued with spiritual energy, doing tasks or assisting you, outside of your own mind. The difference is that the basketball player doesn't actually believe the technique in question is real, as he imagines it; if he imagines a bullseye over the hoop, he doesn't actually fool himself or others into thinking his imagination is a reflection of that reality.

Quote

"Your conclusion does not logically follow from your premise. Allow me to write it out explicitly:

Experimental Setup #1:

Control run with large N: Within expected deviation from chance.  
Experimental run with large N, with participant intent as the only variable changed:  
Far outside of expected deviation from chance.

Experimental Setup #2:

Control run with large N: Far outside of expected deviation from chance.  
Experimental run with large N, with participant intent as the only variable changed:  
Far outside of expected deviation from chance.

Now, you are trying to tell us to deduce from this that Experiment #1's results are invalid. This conclusion does not logically follow from the information given. Experiment #1 has only one variable changed from the Control run and the Experimental run, and by changing only this one variable, the participant intent, a largely significant deviation results in the measurement. The setup in experiment #2 is faulty from the beginning, because the control run is invalid. This indicates a strong probability that experiment #2 is utilizing faulty hardware if its RNG is ALWAYS yielding non-chance results.

As I explained, for RNG experiments, a preliminary control run is usually done when a setup is first created to ensure that the RNG is actually random. This is a standard sanity check to make sure your equipment is working before you even think about conducting an experiment. If someone's setup fails the equipment check, then they are not ready to do an experiment.

And once this is done, "results" in a controlled experiment are entirely based on the differences between the experimental run and the control run. Because of this, the evaluation of each experiment can in principle be done completely independently of other experiments and setups. The presence of a control run of significant length, and the protocol of results being a comparison between the experimental and the control run, mean that when only one variable is altered between the two conditions, and a significant result is obtained, then a causal relationship has been demonstrated."

You don't seem to be getting it: The machine didn't run the deviations from chance without people being involved, in a control run. The RNG produced the deviation from chance far outside the expected, just by having people be involved in the test, without concentrating. Not intent, not focused on changing it's results. Just sitting in front of it, reading a magazine, daydreaming, etc. The same manner of 'success' that is being cited as psychic proof, achieved with the same manner of control run within chance boundaries, and experimental run with test subject in room, just not trying to achieve a difference in it's output. Wee.

Quote

"I've never once claimed that the evidence is uncontested. In fact, I've said it IS contested. But it is also overwhelming and conclusive. The overwhelmingness and conclusivity of evidence are purely a measure of its intrinsic scientific strength. For evidence to be uncontested, it must be unquestioned. Sadly, the latter does not follow

from the former when cherished philosophies are involved.

You have demonstrated for us a propensity for arguing against a point, even when faced with a blatantly obvious scan of a page which shows one thing when you are saying it shows another. How can we expect that scientific evidence will be given a fairer shake than an image right before your eyes? Clearly contention has nothing to do with truth for many."

Another attempt at deception, in the vein of Radin: I have most certainly not been shown a page and argued against a point/it's contents. In my last response, in fact, I specifically noted what the author was saying, in relation to the pages. I even sourced the origin of the information being graphed, which, laughably, was from a quack with a history of being duped and marking down false results as 'scientific evidence.' Further, you either are lying, or simply don't understand what the word "conclusive" means, as you fairly opened up the debate with the statement that the evidence was such, and yet now state you've never claimed the evidence is uncontested. **con·clu·sive** (P) Pronunciation Key (kn-klsv) adj. Serving to put an end to doubt, question, or uncertainty; decisive. See Synonyms at decisive.

Quote

"This seems to have much less to do with the researcher's beliefs than with the researcher's handling of participants. What is quite well documented is that the expectations of participants enormously change their ability to do psi. If participants believe they will fail, the results are very weak or negative. If participants believe they will succeed, the results are generally strong or positive. This can and has been well-established using two-tailed test. (The two-tailed test raises the required threshold for statistical significance to allow analysis of variables that can go in two directions.)"

Another intentional deception; speaking factually about something that has, to date, not been proven as factual. Your assumptive confusions about what you think is happening, and what is actually happening without proper explanation, seem to be an ongoing problem. What is well documented, is that the expectations of a participant in a test can enormously change their ability in a test. There is no correlation between this, and the outcome of a deviation from chance, unless you can demonstrate that the person involved is having some active effect. If a person can sit in front of a machine and read a book, and the machine deviates (as has been repeatedly mentioned, and repeatedly attempted to be glossed over by you and those in your camp) from chance expectation, then obviously the person's confidence level in performance is irrelevant, because they aren't performing anything. They just happen to be in the area of effect. Your claim is much akin to an idiot claiming that a person's confidence level will affect how much they show up on a thermal imaging system: they have no active participation in being seen in a thermal imaging test, and whether they believe they will show up more or less warm for instance, has no actual bearing on how they show up. They are necessary components in the thermal imaging test, but the results of the test, like with the RNGs, are not dependant at all upon their personal abilities or mindset.

Quote

"1)-In both the Ganzfeld and AutoGanzfeld, not all the rooms where tests were conducted had sound-proof rooms, potential sensory leakage.

Find a scholarly publication documenting this, including a description of exactly which lab had this problem."

Gladly. "In 1994 Bem and Honorton published a report in the prestigious journal Psychological Bulletin, bringing the research to the notice of a far wider audience. They republished Honorton's earlier meta-analysis and reported impressive new results with a fully automated ganzfeld procedure -- the Princeton autoganzfeld -- claiming finally to have demonstrated a repeatable experiment. Not long afterwards Wiseman, Smith, and Kornbrot (1996) suggested that acoustic leakage might have been possible in the original autoganzfeld. This hypothesis was difficult to assess after the fact because by then the laboratory at Princeton had been dismantled.

As far as I know, no appropriate tests have been made to find out. For example, does the subject need to be conscious of the direction of aim at the time? Comments in the published papers suggest that some subjects actually do better when not thinking about the task, or when reading a magazine or being distracted in some other way, suggesting that conscious intent might even be counterproductive."

Quote

"You neglected the most important part of this... Even after Hyman removed the 20 studies he was skeptical of, and kept only the 28 he did like, the odds against chance using only those 28 studies were THEN ten billion to one.

So even when Hyman removed everything he could find to be critical of, the results were still overwhelming. (The autoganzfeld was then formulated to remove the criticisms that came up during this analysis.)"

To the contrary: the most important part of the quote you're responding to was not the success rate Hyman came to, after editing out a huge 48% of the database. The most important part was that about half of the entire data being used to calculate the successes in such trials, were extremely flawed, and -still- used and considered "objective" by the people making the meta-analysis. People like Utts, Radin, Targ and Puthoff. Further, such flawed materials, even after such criticisms have been pointed out, and the tests yet further refined, are still being mentioned in compilations of 'evidence' by such as Radin, in his issue-riddled Conscious Universe. If successes are to be tallied, they should be tallied only of rates of success counting data that has been deemed unfaulted and not subject to the criticisms thusfar, such as the reformulated autoganzfeld you mentioned. Yet he's still using outdated, flawed materials in his book, and such are still being pointed to today by Parapsychologists in support of psi.

Quote

"What you should expect is that participants get better at the task as they receive

practice. This is sensible, and it has been observed in ganzfeld experiments and elsewhere that when participants receive feedback telling them whether or not they were right (as occurs in ganzfeld experiments), their subsequent scores improve. This effect can easily result in the correlation described."

What I should reasonably expect is that people get better at something with practice. Practice and improvement should not happen and be evident across the board between the first and second try, in the matter of a minute or less, especially without feedback on success or failure of the first attempt before the second is attempted. Practice generally provides improvement based upon noticing a previous failure, or technique that can be corrected, and then applying that correction of technique gained from the previous attempt's failure. The subjects in question had no means of knowing whether their previous guess had been success or failure when the image reappeared, which is not indicative of improvement through 'practice' as you would have us believe, but an improvement based upon observation of the testing methods or materials.

Quote

"His results were ALSO "highly significant", by his own words, entirely of their own accord.

Regarding which data is included in meta-analyses, that depends on the format of the experiment. When examining strict replication of the autoganzfeld, those doing a meta-analysis only accept experiments which follow the format strictly, and exclude those who attempt new deviations. The deviations from the original format have value in that they are trying something new, but they are not precise replications."

His results were also including "all experiments. Flawed or not, standard or not." His apparent rate of success by his own admission then, is taking into consideration that he cannot be sure the data used to come to such a conclusion was even valid or accurate in either controls or gathering. This is the specific brand of deceptive quotation or misquotation that Radin employs in his book, which has yet, I've noticed, to be addressed by you.

Also, we'll note the criticism earlier mentioned that in his book, Radin does not employ the same method of strict format used in his own analysis and presentation of his 'evidences', applying the effects of the lunar phases or various other energy sources in some, as he does to others. If his opinion is correct, what has he to lose by including in every graph that supposedly supports his claims, all the measuring aspects and associations he notes throughout his book, so that we can see the overall relations, or not, that are actually present? Hm.

Quote

MachineChimera

Are you reading what I'm writing before replying? Or do you not understand the meaning in text? I'll simplify for you. Stating what will happen, is not stating which way/how it will happen. Saying "I will make more 1's than is usual by natural



occurrence" is stating what you claim will happen. It does not state how, in which way, or to what degree. It is as vague as saying "I will get food from the store." It says nothing about what food, how much, or how you will arrive there to get it.

Kobok

"By that logic, saying that you will try to make as many baskets as you can in a game of basketball has no meaning."

Negative. Saying you will make "as many baskets as you can" in a game is not a claim of an ability. It's a claim of intent. A test does not verify the absence or presence of intent. Stating "I will shoot 4 more baskets than I normally do" is a claim of ability. It can be tested.

Quote

"I have no idea what you are trying to say here.

But if you really want to understand, roll that six-sided dice of yours 10,000 times, really high, and make sure it loops at least 6 or 7 times each throw. If you get more than 1720 or so fours, then you should be outrageously surprised. Feel free to try this several times."

According to McCrone, the "size of the effect is about .1 percent, meaning that for every thousand electronic tosses, the random event generator is producing about one more head or tail than it should by chance alone" (McCrone 1994).

Really? ONE lonely 1 more than chance in every thousand RNG outputs? That's hardly the attention-grabbing "1720 or so" out of a cycle of 6 or 7 throws, thrown 10,000 times. But then you, like Radin, seem to have a growing history of sensationalistic claims. See below for more on this.

Quote

"Uh... Einstein's famous quote about quantum mechanics and determinism is "God does not play dice with the universe". Hawking's famous quote in response to this is "Not only does God play dice, but... he sometimes throws them where they cannot be seen." So even Hawking is convinced, as are most modern physicists, that the world is non-deterministic based on the weight of evidence. If Einstein had lived long enough to see the current state of evidence, he would probably concur as well."

You're responding by not responding to what I typed. What a novel idea! Hawkings agrees with Einstein in regard to much of his gravitational theorem, and further the issue was that Determinism has not been proven anything, either wrong or right. It's still being pursued by many minds in the community, and is still a the rule for pretty much everything that's NOT quantum in science, primarily the natural sciences. And How did you come to conclude what Einstein's thoughts would probably be, were he alive today, on the subject? Another assumption stated in a factual fashion... or did you channel him with your psychic power?

Quote

"In quantum mechanics, this rule no longer applies. By the rules of quantum mechanics, the presence of knowledge itself about a system causes its state to change, so this results in a fundamental inability to determine the state of a system. It is not simply an ignorance of how to determine the state, but a consequence of the effect of having that knowledge. This is somewhat counter-intuitive and violates the reasoning we use in the classical world, but hey, that's what quantum mechanics is like."

Mm. Well, if the RNG is truly a quantumly generated function, governed by quantum law, then knowledge of how it should behave will alter its behavioral state, by your own admission. So you cannot possibly discern what is actual affect resulting from anyone's interaction with it based upon some ability or power, and what is simply resulting because of the person's knowledge of how the system will behave, alone. Sounds like an awful predicament to be in, frankly.

Quote

"You really want to defend that point?"

I will simply post the image of the page for anyone reading along to judge for themselves.

(Anyone wishing to read the entire chapter should consider buying it. It is worth the price for anyone interested enough to read through the oversized volume which has become this thread.)"

Obviously, I'm asserting it, so yes, do scan the page in question so we can all see the graph, and note when the spike in question begins to drop off, against the time the verdict was actually read.

As to the graph on page 181, I'm not certain if the writer in question was talking about the actual graph, or the information relating to it on the pages preceding and following it. I am certain however, that it's laughable that Puharich's "telepathy test" is even being included at all as valid evidence by Radin himself. Puharich is, besides gallavantiing about the scientific community backing Uri's amazing powers, the same nut that brought over Peter Hurkos, and claimed among other things to have invented a perpetual energy device. The man is by all accounts, a delusional, paranoid crackpot. Radin's building himself quite a case with a book inclusive of data from cases blatantly outdated as far as controls against fraud and objectivity-biased experimented, including the ganzfeld themselves. Stargate was dropped not merely by the government at large, but by the CIA following, as being unsuccessful. Autoganzfeld seems to be just about the only thing left to cling to for you psi-supporters, and even it is not conclusive, as we've demonstrated with the very defining of the word, contrary to your personal word choice.

Going back to the PEAR experiments, I'll repost the following: "In 1987, Dean Radin and

Nelson did a meta-analysis of all RNG experiments done between 1959 and 1987 and found that they produced odds against chance beyond a trillion to one (Radin 1997: 140). This sounds impressive, but as Radin says "in terms of a 50% hit rate, the overall experimental effect, calculated per study, was about 51 percent, where 50 percent would be expected by chance" [emphasis added] (141). A couple of sentences later, Radin gives a more precise rendering of "about 51 percent" by noting that the overall effect was "just under 51 percent." Similar results were found with experiments where people tried to use their minds to affect the outcome of rolls of the dice, according to Radin. And, when Nelson did his own analysis of all the PEAR data (1,262 experiments involving 108 people), he found similar results to the earlier RNG studies but "with odds against chance of four thousand to one" (Radin 1997: 143). Nelson also claimed that there were no "star" performers."

REALLY? No star performers? They all did equally well across the board, that seems to imply. So then why do we find .. ""the percentage of hits in the intended direction was only 50.02%" in the PEAR studies (Hyman 1989: 152). And one 'operator' (the term used to describe the subjects in these studies) was responsible for 23% of the total data base. His hit rate was 50.05%. Take out this operator and the hit rate becomes 50.01%. According to John McCrone, "Operator 10," believed to be a PEAR staff member, "has been involved in 15% of the 14 million trials, yet contributed to a full half of the total excess hits" (McCrone 1994). According to Dean Radin, the criticism that there "was any one person responsible for the overall results of the experiment...was tested and found to be groundless" (Radin 1997: 221). His source for this claim is a 1991 article by Jahn et al. in the Journal of Scientific Exploration, "Count population profiles in engineering anomalies experiments" (5:205-32). However, Jahn gives the data for his experiments in *Margins of Reality: The Role of Consciousness in the Physical World* (Harcourt Brace, 1988, p. 352-353). McCrone has done the calculations and found that 'If [operator 10's] figures are taken out of the data pool, scoring in the "low intention" condition falls to chance while "high intention" scoring drops close to the .05 boundary considered weakly significant in scientific results." According to McCrone, the "size of the effect is about .1 percent, meaning that for every thousand electronic tosses, the random event generator is producing about one more head or tail than it should by chance alone" (McCrone 1994)."

Why do we continue to see a pattern of Radin sensationalizing findings by attributing such words as "conclusive", "proof", or exaggerating the odds or statistical importance of issues, while claiming to be a skeptic, and entirely leaving out such little tidbits of information when pretending to give a balanced argument to his readers? Also, to date.. where's the response to McCrone's insight by Radin?

Further, you've repeatedly ignored various points of interest in this debate, such as Radin's blatant attempts at deception in his book, by misquoting people he claims are in agreement with his own findings. You've ignored that he claims himself as one of the Associates and Advisors, for purposes of 'genuine skepticism', and further includes under that facility Larry Dosey, a man that thinks he has scientific proof that prayer heals... Gary Swartz, who actually thinks John Edwards gets messages from the dead,

and Rupert Sheldrake, The group of them also list as one of their advisors a man who's been dead for over 3 years now (Marcello Truzzi). He seems to think that he and these other fellows constitute genuine skeptics, and are unbiased and credible in providing same against his own claims? Radin claims there are "thousands" of experiments that -prove- psi exists. To date, not one is recorded as proof of psi. Certainly, even if you counted Autoganzfeld as proof, that would leave about 1,999 more examples to list. As to his mathematical arrival at significance, which you seem so fond of bandying about, we have the following: "Potentially the most important evidence in Radin's book is the chapter on meta-analysis, which is also emphasized in the introduction--and it is here that the 'file drawer' effect comes into play.

Meta-analysis is the combination of results from many experiments. A problem in meta-analysis, and in statistics generally, is how to allow for the researches that remain unpublished and unknown because their P values did not reach a conventional significance level such as 0.05. I do not know who coined the name 'file drawer' effect for this problem. This effect drags down the statistical significance of published work. Radin claims that "parapsychologists were among the first to become sensitive to this problem"--although he does not say when--and he mentions that "in 1975 the Parapsychological Association's officers adopted a policy opposing the selective reporting of positive outcomes". The problem was known to statisticians by 1958.

Consider the following typical example. Radin points out that there were 186 publications on ESP card tests worldwide from 1882 to 1939. "The combined results of this four-million trial database [taken at face value]," he says, "translate into tremendous odds against chance--more than a billion trillion to one." (A 'trial' is the guess of one card) He means that the P value is about  $10^{-21}$ --he is not writing only for the scientific establishment. This P value corresponds to a bulge above 'chance' expectation of 9.5 sigma, where sigma is the standard deviation. (I call that a 'sigmage' of 9.5.)

Apart from the possibility of conscious and unconscious fraud and wishful thinking in some fraction of the publications, Radin claims, with no explanation, that, in order to "nullify" the statistical significance, the file drawer would have to contain "more than 3,300 unpublished, unsuccessful reports for each published report". That number 3,300 is a gross overestimate. It should be reduced at least to about 15 (or even to Cool.

The expected sigmage in the file drawer, under the null hypothesis, would be slightly negative but I will call it zero. If these results were combined with the published work, the total sample size would be multiplied by 16, thus becoming 64 million individual guesses. Given the null hypothesis ('chance'), the bulge would be unaffected so the sigmage would be divided by  $\sqrt{16} = 4$  and would become  $9.5/4 = 2.4$  with a P value of about 1/100.

Because the number of individual guesses is so large, this P value appreciably SUPPORTS the null hypothesis (no ESP). This is because a Bayes factor (the factor by which the odds of a hypothesis are multiplied in light of the observations), corresponding to a fixed P value, is roughly proportional to  $1/\sqrt{N}$ , where N is the

sample size. So Radin's method for evaluating the file-drawer effect, whatever that method may be, must be misguided. This conclusion largely undermines Radin's meta-analysis which is central to his case for ESP."

As noted by I.J. Good, called by many to be, at the very least, a major contributor.. if not the promulgator, of Bayesian Statistics. The man is far, far more experienced with proper statistical calculations than Radin, and I doubt anyone in any community would state that Radin has a better grasp of statistics, or calculating a P value, than Good.

"Radin quotes Hansel as saying that three P values, each of 0.01, amount to one of  $10^{-6}$ , and that he (Radin) would find that convincing. But the product of independent P values is not a P value. The product has to be transformed by a method due to R. A. Fisher. Both Hansel and Radin have overlooked this. In the present example, the composite P value is 1/9000 not 1/1,000,000."

As to J.B. Rhine. "Langmuir visited J.B. Rhine's lab at Duke University where Rhine was claiming results of ESP experiments that could not be predicted by chance and were probably due to some sort of psychic power. Langmuir found that Rhine was not counting all his data, however. He was leaving out the scores of those he believed were guessing their Zener cards wrong on purpose. "Rhine believed that persons who disliked him guessed wrong to spite him. Therefore, he felt it would be misleading to include their scores" (Park 2000, 42). Rhine determined that some of his subjects were deliberately guessing wrong because their scores were too low to have occurred by chance. "Indeed, he was convinced that abnormally low scores were as significant as abnormally high scores in proving the existence of ESP" (ibid.)."

Further, when Rhine's studies were attempted to be reproduced, no success came about. Soal did four years without any results, before eventually being busted under investigation for fraud when he DID start claiming results.

"S. G. Soal (1889-1975) was a British mathematician. By 1939 he had tested over 160 subjects for ESP in more than 128,000 card-guessing trials and had found no evidence of telepathy or clairvoyance. Whately Carrington advised Soal to recheck his data for displacement (Alcock 1981: 154). Someone with psychic powers might be one or two cards ahead or behind in the guessing because of "temporal distraction." The data mining, conducted by Carrington, Robert Thouless, and Mrs. K. M. Goldney, produced two cases that were statistically significant (Proceedings of the Society for Psychical Research 46, 1940-1941). The two stars were Mrs. Gloria Stewart, who did significantly better than chance at naming the card ahead and the card behind the target card in the test series, even though that was not her task nor her intention (Hansel 1989: 100). The other star, Shackleton, had also been unimpressive in tests done in 1938. The "high displacement scores that Soal alleges he found three years later were the first indication of any striking effects in Shackleton's score sheets" (Hansel 1989: 101)."

"Today, it is generally recognized that Soal altered and faked the data, probably unbeknownst to Mrs. Goldney (Alcock 1981: 141). His fraud did significant damage to

parapsychology (Alcock 1981: 140-141). Yet, there are still those who hail his work as having produced “the most cogent of all the evidence brought forth to demonstrate the theory of psychic abilities in mankind” (an admirer on the Internet). But those familiar with the history of parapsychology recognize Soal's deception. Dean Radin, for example, in his elaborate and selective defense of the scientific evidence for psi (The Conscious Universe) does not even mention Soal."

Hm. Radin uses Rhine's data, or makes mention of it in a possitive light, I bet, in his book.. but doesn't mention the four years of it's exact replication yielding no results? Or the subsequent cheating done by Soal to follow? How strange.

Further, as to Radin's assumption that psi is at work because of a statistical deviation from what is EXPECTED by chance. "The assumption is also questionable on methodological grounds. There is no reason to believe that the laws of probability, which are purely formal and ideal, should apply directly to any finite set of events. It may be true that the odds of a coin coming up heads or tails is 1 in 2, but that gives us no information as to what will happen in the real world for any given number of tosses. Ideally, in a large number of tosses, heads should come up 50% of the time. In the real world, there is no way to know exactly how many times heads will come up in, say, ten million tosses. We can be pretty sure the number will be very close to five million (assuming a fair coin and a fair toss), but we cannot know a priori exactly how many times heads will come up.

Studies comparing random strings with random strings, to simulate guessing numbers or cards, have found significant departures from what would be expected theoretically by chance (Alcock 1981: 159). For example, Harvie “selected 50,000 digits from various sources of random numbers and used them to represent “target cards” in an ESP experiment. Instead of having subjects make guesses, a series of 50,000 random numbers were produced by a computer.” He found a hit rate that was significantly less than what would be predicted by chance (Alcock 1981: 158-159).

In the 1930s, Walter Pitkin of Columbia University printed up 200,000 cards, half red and half blue, with 40,000 of each of the five ESP card symbols. The cards were mechanically shuffled and read by a machine. The result was two lists of 100,000 randomly selected symbols. One list would represent chance distribution of the symbols and the other would represent chance guessing of the symbols. However, the actual matches and what would be predicted by accepted odds didn't match up. The total number was 2% under mathematical expectancy. Runs of 5 matching pairs were 25% under and runs of 7 were 59% greater than mathematical expectancy (Christopher 1970: 27-28). The point is not whether these runs are typical in a real world of real randomness or whether they represent some peculiarity of the shuffling machine or some other quirk. The point is that it is not justified to assume that statistical probability based on true randomness and a very large number of instances applies without further consideration to any finite operation in the real world such as guessing symbols in decks of 25 cards shuffled who knows how or how often, or rolling dice, or trying to affect a random number generator with one's mind. As Alcock put it: “If such significant

variation can be produced by comparing random strings with random strings, then the assumption that any significant variation from chance is due to psi seems untenable (Alcock 1981: 158-159)."

The logical fallacy here, it should be pointed out, is that of Affirming the Consequent. "If it's psi, then the data deviate from chance. The data deviate from chance. So, it's psi. Or, if a person is psychic, that person will do better than chance in guessing experiments. That person did better than chance in a guessing experiment. Therefore, that person is psychic.)" Something that's been pointed out numerous times. Even IF Radin's work could be shaved down to test results that were all, entirely approved and unable to be found faulted or potentially flawed, and even if under these conditions significant deviations from chance expectation could be earned, and even IF these successes were repeatable in other laboratories by skeptics using the same conditions, it would not be proof of Psi. It would be proof only that for reasons UNKNOWN/UNPROVEN, the outcome was not matching with what was expected by chance. Notwithstanding, none of those 'if' conditions have been achieved yet, much less the whole of them, yet we still see the flawed logical fallacy at work. Radin assumes as the basis of the entire test that Psi exists, and that Psi can cause/be responsible for such a deviation, and then attributes such a deviation as proof of psi.

« Last Edit: July 19, 2006, 12:24:19 PM by MachineChimera »      Logged

Rafnul!

he-who-posts-lots

Posts By Osmosis

\*\*\*\*\*

Posts: 1064

Karma: 24

[View Profile](#)

Re: New level of skepticm

« Reply #107 on: July 19, 2006, 12:08:45 PM »

MachineChimera, I'm going to assume you know how psi is defined in parapsychology, but somehow, seem to be neglecting it.

Quote from: MachineChimera on July 19, 2006, 12:00:18 PM

It would be proof only that for reasons UNKNOWN/UNPROVEN, the outcome was not matching with what was expected by chance.

It has always been my understanding that psi is the variable (or in more traditional usage "factor") assigned to those unknown reasons. You're quite right, just as preliminary experiments regarding subatomic particles did not give us precise information on the structure of the atom, our speculation was not affirmed by them.

The same goes for psi, specific explanations are simply speculation. However, psi is an experimental variable, something which either is present or is not, and represents the ability to the experimental results to deviate from chance. Evidence of the nature of psi requires more detailed experiments, where more information is present.

« Last Edit: July 19, 2006, 12:15:18 PM by Rafnul »      Logged

Prophecy

Theurgist

Veritas Teacher

Posts By Osmosis

\*\*\*\*\*

Posts: 1230

Karma: 62

Veritas Teacher

[View Profile](#)

Re: New level of skepticm

« Reply #108 on: July 19, 2006, 12:16:05 PM »

I think next we should argue the existence of string cheese, followed immediately by discarding any possibility of a human being possessing a gallon of milk.

All the scientific data on earth to the contrary could never convince a person who knows he has seen the things he has, and has in fact shared such experiences with multitudes of people, that the contrary opinion could in any shape or form be remotely correct. As I mentioned before your strange infatuation with scientific evidence and the likes is really quite wasted, and you should look into trying to get some of the time back you threw away while gathering it all. I'm surprised you're still having at it, but I suppose everyone needs something to do. In the end, however, you're really only having a discussion with Kobok, and in so far as everyone else is concerned you can only fail at what you may be trying to do.

Logged

<http://www.thedivinescience.org>

MachineChimera

Settling In

\*

Posts: 37

Karma: 0

[View Profile](#)



Re: New level of skepticm

« Reply #109 on: July 19, 2006, 12:36:07 PM »

Quote

"MachineChimera, I'm going to assume you know how psi is defined in parapsychology, but somehow, seem to be neglecting it.

Quote from: MachineChimera on Today at 12:00:18 PM

It would be proof only that for reasons UNKNOWN/UNPROVEN, the outcome was not matching with what was expected by chance.

It has always been my understanding that psi is the variable (or in more traditional usage "factor") assigned to those unknown reasons. You're quite right, just as preliminary experiments regarding subatomic particles did not give us precise information on the structure of the atom, our speculation was not affirmed by them. The same goes for psi, specific explanations are simply speculation. However, psi is an experimental variable, something which either is present or is not, and represents the ability to the experimental results to deviate from chance. Evidence of the nature of psi requires more detailed experiments, where more information is present. "

Psi is the variable assumed, indeed.. but it's merely that, Raf; an assumption. It's affirmation by consequence. Logical Fallacy. Quite true about preliminary experimentation with subatomic particles, but the same should hold true in the case of so-called psi and other paranormal claims, by the same vein: if someone wrote a book and ran about touting such preliminary evidences as fact of subatomic particles, they'd have been ridiculed the same way Radin is.

Quote

"I think next we should argue the existence of string cheese, followed immediately by discarding any possibility of a human being possessing a gallon of milk.

All the scientific data on earth to the contrary could never convince a person who knows he has seen the things he has, and has in fact shared such experiences with multitudes of people, that the contrary opinion could in any shape or form be remotely correct. As I mentioned before your strange infatuation with scientific evidence and the likes is really quite wasted, and you should look into trying to get some of the time back you threw away while gathering it all. I'm surprised you're still having at it, but I suppose everyone needs something to do. In the end, however, you're really only having a discussion with Kobok, and in so far as everyone else is concerned you can only fail at what you may be trying to do. " -Prophecy

The fallacy there is the acceptance that what one thinks they've seen, under non-controlled conditions, is what's actually occurred. By this same philosophy, you would visit a stage magician and actually believe the person called up has been magically sawed in half, and is otherwise not harmed or injured, or that coins are really

being pulled from your ears, and so on. Yet you don't, I'd imagine. When you go to the movies, you don't confuse what you're seeing, video footage of a murderer possessed by devils or something, stabbing people, to be actually happening, even though to a person from a more primitive time might well see the same in a theater and mistake it for a hole in the air through which they're seeing something actually occurring in real time, or a vision in the darkness. Neither do I consider killing some time at work in this debate to be an utter waste, as I've learned more about some of the pressing materials out there that people might cling to as support of psychic or magickal hooplah.

I've known from the onset however that I won't be convincing anyone here to give up their fantasies. I'd be about as successful pointing out reality in these instances as I would on a board dedicated to any religion; you can't use reason or fact to make people give up Faith. All I'm doing here, is illustrating that (as by your comment about KNOWING something is true despite facts or evidence to the contrary on account of personal experience), such things are matters of faith, purely, and not realistic at all. If they were real, someone would step up to any of the NUMEROUS organizations that offer ludicrous sums of money and easy living for the rest of one's life, in exchange for demonstration of powers in such a controlled setting.

In the end, there's no harm in make-believing any of this, aside from the wastings of your own time, talking about it like it's real and so forth. I'm just glad there's now something in the site that some potential questioner might stumble upon, early into it, and find some light to reason before getting entangled in all this stuff.

« Last Edit: July 19, 2006, 12:38:52 PM by MachineChimera »      Logged

Rafnul!

he-who-posts-lots

Posts By Osmosis

\*\*\*\*\*

Posts: 1064

Karma: 24

[View Profile](#)

Re: New level of skepticm

« Reply #110 on: July 19, 2006, 01:37:10 PM »

I think you didn't understand what I just said. I said, psi IS the Unknown cause. There aren't any inherent assumptions made about psi. We have simply named the unknown factor psi. The fact of the matter is, by some unknown mechanism, the results have deviated from chance. We named that mechanism psi. Now, there reason why they point at "psychic" abilities is because that would appear to be a "solution" which fits the bill. No one is say the results prove psychic abilities. The results prove that there exists a deviation from chance beyond that which is expected. Once more, that

deviation itself, is psi. "Psions" as opposed to parapsychologists or members of other fields are only interested in coming to understand that deviation and how it might be controlled or amplified. Those of us who are looking for truth aren't being pretentious nutballs about it and assuming that it must be specific agents that it occurs. Instead, we devote our time to trying to figure by what agent we might be able to influence this deviation. Hence, you get wild theories and speculation, until we come to something that fits the bill, and then we operate under the assumption that it may be the case, in so far that we are able to grow in understanding and influence with it.

Logged  
kobok  
Veritas Council  
Tech Team  
Posts By Osmosis  
\*\*\*\*\*

Posts: 4743  
Karma: 148

Veritas Council

[View Profile](#)

Re: New level of skepticm

« Reply #111 on: July 19, 2006, 02:09:35 PM »

Quote from: MachineChimera on July 19, 2006, 12:00:18 PM

An apt analogy for the issue, and especially helpful for my case. If the modulate the variable of the cheese being outside of the fridge by leaving it in, and it aged as quickly as the cheese left outside, the hypothesis that the cheese molds/ages faster depending upon the temperature of it's surroundings would be unverified. You get the same results in the warm surroundings, as in the chilled/fridge.

You are correct that, if this happened, it would not provide support for the fridge helping cheese not get fuzzy, nor would this comparable result provide support for the existence of psi in a parapsychology study. However, this is not the result obtained in parapsychology studies. In the vast majority of parapsychology studies, especially the ones of significant size, the experimental run and the control run DO differ in the hypothesized direction. If you are trying to imply otherwise, I challenge you to show otherwise with evidence.

Quote from: MachineChimera on July 19, 2006, 12:00:18 PM

Quote

"You are confusing a controlled experiment with a self-selected sample. These are completely different phenomena within statistics, and must be addressed entirely

differently."

Oh? So then let's expand it beyond self-selected sample. Let's consider every single person that's ever won the lottery, and the astronomical odds against them. Let's calculate their combined success rate of 'beating chance' by winning the lottery from the time lottery tickets began sales, to present. Now, let's point to the deviation, and then freely create a fantastical explanation for the apparent, unexplainable deviation from expected chance that's occurred. Those damn magical entities between space and time, up to their old tricks again.

This is what statisticians refer to as a "natural" experiment, and is still not a controlled experiment. Where is the control group? Without one, it is not a controlled experiment.

Quote from: MachineChimera on July 19, 2006, 12:00:18 PM

You don't seem to be getting it: The machine didn't run the deviations from chance without people being involved, in a control run. The RNG produced the deviation from chance far outside the expected, just by having people be involved in the test, without concentrating. Not intent, not focused on changing it's results. Just sitting in front of it, reading a magazine, daydreaming, etc.

I've said many many times, "changing only one variable". If you change multiple variables, then you can potentially measure multiple variables. In whatever hypothetical study you are quoting completely without reference, the variable changed was placing a person in front of an RNG or not between the experimental and the control run. Why placing a person in front of an RNG produces a change in a faraday isolated RNG is still something which warrants an explanation, but it is not a measurement of what is being discussed here. In controlled experiments, only one variable, the INTENT is varied, which means a participant is also sitting there for the control run.

Quote from: MachineChimera on July 19, 2006, 12:00:18 PM

Quote

"1)-In both the Ganzfeld and AutoGanzfeld, not all the rooms where tests were conducted had sound-proof rooms, potential sensory leakage.

Find a scholarly publication documenting this, including a description of exactly which lab had this problem."

Gladly. "In 1994 Bem and Honorton published a report in the prestigious journal Psychological Bulletin, bringing the research to the notice of a far wider audience. They republished Honorton's earlier meta-analysis and reported impressive new results with a fully automated ganzfeld procedure -- the Princeton autoganzfeld -- claiming finally to have demonstrated a repeatable experiment. Not long afterwards Wiseman, Smith, and Kornbrot (1996) suggested that acoustic leakage might have been possible in the original autoganzfeld. This hypothesis was difficult to assess after the fact because by

then the laboratory at Princeton had been dismantled.

So according to the reference, three people who never saw the original setup proposed ten years after the experiment was run that there must have been acoustic leakage into the soundproof room, when the on-site examiners such as Daryl Bem (a psychologist who later coauthored a paper with Honorton 8 years later), and stage magician and mentalist Ford Kross, who actually went to SEE the setup, concluded that it was secure. Kross wrote,

"In my professional capacity as a mentalist, I have reviewed Psychophysical Research Laboratories' automated ganzfeld system and found it to provide excellent security against deception by subjects."

I'll take that over a random speculation of two people who never looked at the site, but speculate that it "might have been" leaky somehow. This is quite a difference from your initial claim that they were known to be leaky.

Quote from: MachineChimera on July 19, 2006, 12:00:18 PM

Further, such flawed materials, even after such criticisms have been pointed out, and the tests yet further refined, are still being mentioned in compilations of 'evidence' by such as Radin, in his issue-riddled Conscious Universe.

You know not of what you speak. The Conscious Universe explicitly describes Hyman's criticism (pages 78-79) of the 20 out of 48 studies, and compares the analysis with or without them to assess the relevance of those criticisms to the significance of the effect. I told you at the beginning that he discusses essentially every prominently published criticism of the results he discusses, yet for some reason you continue to presume otherwise.

Quote from: MachineChimera on July 19, 2006, 12:00:18 PM

What I should reasonably expect is that people get better at something with practice. Practice and improvement should not happen and be evident across the board between the first and second try, in the matter of a minute or less, especially without feedback on success or failure of the first attempt before the second is attempted. Practice generally provides improvement based upon noticing a previous failure, or technique that can be corrected, and then applying that correction of technique gained from the previous attempt's failure. The subjects in question had no means of knowing whether their previous guess had been success or failure when the image reappeared

Again, you are incorrect. If you read the publications about the ganzfeld protocol you will see that this is the case. The last step of every run is that the correct answer is revealed for feedback purposes, which is explicitly done so that participants can improve their skill with practice.

Quote from: MachineChimera on July 19, 2006, 12:00:18 PM

Negative. Saying you will make "as many baskets as you can" in a game is not a claim

of an ability. It's a claim of intent. A test does not verify the absence or presence of intent. Stating "I will shoot 4 more baskets than I normally do" is a claim of ability. It can be tested.

And if you shoot 6 more baskets than you normally do, is that a success or failure? (That's not a rhetorical question, I expect you to choose one of those.)

Quote from: MachineChimera on July 19, 2006, 12:00:18 PM

According to McCrone, the "size of the effect is about .1 percent, meaning that for every thousand electronic tosses, the random event generator is producing about one more head or tail than it should by chance alone" (McCrone 1994).

Really? ONE lonely 1 more than chance in every thousand RNG outputs?

That sounds kind of small until you consider that the RNGs used typically output around 10 million bits per second. So that 0.1% corresponds to 10,000 more 1's every single second. I'd love to see the basketball player who could keep up. Wink

In the ganzfeld, however, where each run can sometimes take on the order of an hour or more, results are typically on the order of 32%-35% in comparison to 25% chance. If you could do that with a fair four-sided die without physical contact, it would be impressive...

Quote from: MachineChimera on July 19, 2006, 12:00:18 PM

Hawkings agrees with Einstein in regard to much of his gravitational theorem, and further the issue was that Determinism has not been proven anything, either wrong or right. It's still being pursued by many minds in the community, and is still a the rule for pretty much everything that's NOT quantum in science, primarily the natural sciences. And How did you come to conclude what Einstein's thoughts would probably be, were he alive today, on the subject?

Determinism is unrelated to general relativity. I didn't respond to that comment because it has no meaning. You are simply repeating your claim without basis that determinism is somehow accepted by "many" ambiguous minds, when I being a physicist have not seen that in physicists, nor learned that in my courses, nor read it in any modern textbooks. I have in fact, seen the opposite, learned the opposite in courses, and read the opposite in modern textbooks. So if you're going to make a crazy claim about determinism somehow being a presumption outside of philosophy, you're going to have to do better than "many minds".

Quote from: MachineChimera on July 19, 2006, 12:00:18 PM

Mm. Well, if the RNG is truly a quantumly generated function, governed by quantum law, then knowledge of how it should behave will alter it's behavioral state, by your own admission. So you cannot possibly discern what is actual affect resulting from anyone's interaction with it based upon some ability or power, and what is simply resulting because of the person's knowledge of how the system will behave, alone.

Sounds like an awful predicament to be in, frankly.

If this were true, then we would have our mechanism for psi. However, quantum mechanics as it is best known does not permit the passage of classical information via this method. The reasons why it does not permit the transfer of classical information require math which will not fit into the margins here.

However, I encourage you to find a means by which quantum mechanics permits a person to alter the result of a RNG by means of changing something inside his or her mind. If you succeed, you will have expanded the laws of physics to include the kinesis you are trying to argue does not exist.

Quote from: MachineChimera on July 19, 2006, 12:00:18 PM

Obviously, I'm asserting it, so yes, do scan the page in question so we can all see the graph, and note when the spike in question begins to drop off, against the time the verdict was actually read.

Uh... I did. Read up to where I said "image of the page" and provided a link to the image of the page.

Quote from: MachineChimera on July 19, 2006, 12:00:18 PM

Going back to the PEAR experiments, I'll repost the following: "In 1987, Dean Radin and Nelson did a meta-analysis of all RNG experiments done between 1959 and 1987 and found that they produced odds against chance beyond a trillion to one (Radin 1997: 140). This sounds impressive, but as Radin says &#32;&#59;&#59;&#59;,"in terms of a 50% hit rate, the overall experimental effect, calculated per study, was about 51 percent, where 50 percent would be expected by chance&#101;&#59;&#59;&#59;" [emphasis added] (141). A couple of sentences later, Radin gives a more precise rendering of "about 51 percent" by noting that the overall effect was "just under 51 percent." Similar results were found with experiments where people tried to use their minds to affect the outcome of rolls of the dice, according to Radin. And, when Nelson did his own analysis of all the PEAR data (1,262 experiments involving 108 people), he found similar results to the earlier RNG studies but "with odds against chance of four thousand to one" (Radin 1997: 143). Nelson also claimed that there were no "star" performers."

REALLY? No star performers? They all did equally well across the board, that seems to imply. So then why do we find .. "&#34;&#59;&#59;&#59;,"the percentage of hits in the intended direction was only 50.02%" in the PEAR studies (Hyman 1989: 152). And one &#32;&#59;&#59;&#59;'operator&#114;&#59;&#59;&#59;' (the term used to describe the subjects in these studies) was responsible for 23% of the total data base. His hit rate was 50.05%. Take out this operator and the hit rate becomes 50.01%. According to John McCrone, "Operator 10," believed to be a PEAR staff member, "has been involved in 15% of the 14 million trials, yet contributed to a full half of the total excess hits" (McCrone 1994). According to Dean Radin, the criticism that there "was any one person responsible for the overall results of the experiment...was tested and

found to be groundless" (Radin 1997: 221). His source for this claim is a 1991 article by Jahn et al. in the Journal of Scientific Exploration, "Count population profiles in engineering anomalies experiments" (5:205-32). However, Jahn gives the data for his experiments in Margins of Reality: The Role of Consciousness in the Physical World (Harcourt Brace, 1988, p. 352-353). McCrone has done the calculations and found that 'If [operator 10's] figures are taken out of the data pool, scoring in the "low intention" condition falls to chance while "high intention" scoring drops close to the .05 boundary considered weakly significant in scientific results."

You are comparing Nelson's meta-analysis, done in 1996 using all the data generated until then, with meta-analyses done in 1987 and 1988. It should not surprise you that the one done in 1996 has data which was gathered in the intervening 8 or 9 years which is not included in the '87 and '88 meta-analyses. This is not "fraud" on the part of the '96 analysis or on those who quote it, it is simply that more data was available. Welcome to the world of science.

Quote from: MachineChimera on July 19, 2006, 12:00:18 PM

Further, you've repeatedly ignored various points of interest in this debate, such as Radin's blatant attempts at deception in his book, by misquoting people he claims are in agreement with his own findings.

Those claims of misquoting were made by the same individual who cannot read basic graphs or basic sentences. I have discussed them in previous threads, and do not feel like getting into them again. The argument of the critic is basically that Radin quotes people, without quoting everything they have ever said on the topic. At no point does Radin alter the contents of a quote. It's just that he quotes what he considers relevant to the topic he is discussing in each specific section. This is how quoting is done, and criticizing this has no scientific value.

Quote from: MachineChimera on July 19, 2006, 12:00:18 PM

Consider the following typical example. Radin points out that there were 186 publications on ESP card tests worldwide from 1882 to 1939. "The combined results of this four-million trial database [taken at face value]," he says, "translate into tremendous odds against chance--more than a billion trillion to one." (A 'trial' is the guess of one card) He means that the P value is about  $10^{-21}$ --he is not writing only for the scientific establishment. This P value corresponds to a bulge above 'chance' expectation of 9.5 sigma, where sigma is the standard deviation. (I call that a 'sigmage' of 9.5.)

Apart from the possibility of conscious and unconscious fraud and wishful thinking in some fraction of the publications, Radin claims, with no explanation, that, in order to "nullify" the statistical significance, the file drawer would have to contain "more than 3,300 unpublished, unsuccessful reports for each published report". That number 3,300 is a gross overestimate. It should be reduced at least to about 15 (or even to 8).

The 15 or 8 is quite wrong. Allow me to show why. Look at this plot here:



<http://www.ltconline.net/greenl/Courses/201/probdist/zScore2.gif>

The area under the normal curve in that plot represents all possible chance results. The shaded area is for a z-score of 1.82. A z score of 9.5, like you are discussing, would represent the area under the curve 5 times farther to the right on that graph. Now what you are proposing is that 186 publications in the area under the curve around  $z=9.5$  can be nullified by 8 or 15 other publications placed elsewhere in the curve, and then you will have the normal expected chance result yielding the shape of the normal curve. By simple spatial examination of the curve you can see how ridiculous this notion is.

Quote from: MachineChimera on July 19, 2006, 12:00:18 PM

The logical fallacy here, it should be pointed out, is that of Affirming the Consequent. "If it's psi, then the data deviate from chance. The data deviate from chance. So, it's psi. Or, if a person is psychic, that person will do better than chance in guessing experiments. That person did better than chance in a guessing experiment. Therefore, that person is psychic.)"

In a controlled experiment such as used during psi influence experiments, the reasoning is: "If only one variable changes between control runs and experimental runs, and the result deviates significantly, then the variable changed caused the resulting deviation." This is classic and standard scientific reasoning. If you dispute this reasoning, either you are wrong, or the bulk of science must be discarded. I've noticed you don't like it when I conclude with statements like that, but when discussing very basic concepts like the reasoning used in a controlled experiment, then I'm afraid it IS true.

In a perception experiment, the comparison is to the chance result which would be obtained in the absence of any information. (For the case of perception, this cannot be obtained from changing a single variable because there is no rigorously observable way to turn "off" psi perception. This sources from the fact that for perception, the measurement is the answer reported by the participant, rather than the result reported by an external device, as in influence experiments. You cannot distract someone's attention, and simultaneously ask them what they guess that the answer is. The best you can do in this direction is to compare performance under focused conditions versus distracted conditions, in which you can show that the focused condition is far more successful.) Therefore, isolation and distance are used to eliminate classical means of communication. If you consider the actual experimental conditions, which have ranged from soundproof rooms with no physical items in contact, to distances of thousands of miles, then it is easy to see that classical means of communication are removed as an explanation. In this case, psi perception is defined as receiving knowledge through no classical or spatial means.

I have not responded to any ad hominem against parapsychologists. If you want to debate, debate on the merits of the evidence. I have no interest in discussing for hours on end whether or not you believe you can ridicule large numbers of scientists. Such

ridicule has no scientific value.

« Last Edit: July 19, 2006, 03:30:49 PM by kobok »      Logged

Zake

Veritas Staff

Veritas Moderator

Posts By Osmosis

\*\*\*\*\*

Posts: 1722

Karma: 0

Veritas Staff

[View Profile](#)

Re: New level of skepticm

« Reply #112 on: July 19, 2006, 03:42:12 PM »

Quote from: MachineChimera on July 19, 2006, 12:36:07 PM

The fallacy there is the acceptance that what one thinks they've seen, under non-controlled conditions, is what's actually occurred. By this same philosophy, you would visit a stage magician and actually believe the person called up has been magically sawed in half, and is otherwise not harmed or injured, or that coins are really being pulled from your ears, and so on. Yet you don't, I'd imagine. When you go to the movies, you don't confuse what you're seeing, video footage of a murderer possessed by devils or something, stabbing people, to be actually happening, even though to a person from a more primitive time might well see the same in a theater and mistake it for a hole in the air through which they're seeing something actually occurring in real time, or a vision in the darkness.

Wait, my entire life has been in non-controlled conditions! Cheesy Does that mean that I don't know anything that's happened? My memories are unverifiable? Oh n03z!

Seriously, though, I don't see your point here. Scientific studies are good in that they offer a formal procedure by which one can demonstrate to a distanced group of people that a phenomenon has occurred, but regular old experience is fine for those who actually get to experience the phenomena demonstrated. If I magically bend a spoon sitting in my house, that's pretty cool- and I can assume, based on seeing the spoon bend, that the spoon actually bent. Assuming that I'm the butt of some stage magician's prank, or that it's some crazy special effect, or that I'm actually in some Matrix-esque all-immersive VR movie would be... well, psychologically paranoid, really.

Quote from: MachineChimera on July 19, 2006, 12:36:07 PM

All I'm doing here, is illustrating that (as by your comment about KNOWING something is true despite facts or evidence to the contrary on account of personal experience),

such things are matters of faith, purely, and not realistic at all. If they were real, someone would step up to any of the NUMEROUS organizations that offer ludicrous sums of money and easy living for the rest of one's life, in exchange for demonstration of powers in such a controlled setting.

Speaking of non-scientifically-controlled studies, those little contests prove little, in my opinion. As was previously mentioned, the number of people who can reliably produce effects dramatic enough to win them a million dollars is presumably pretty small- we're not hiding some Harry Potter secret wizard world here. I'm not sure (and I mean no offense to anyone as I say this- I've just never bothered to find out >\_> ) that theres even anyone on this site who could, at will, produce a certain desired physical effect at any given time in non-ideal circumstances- which, as far as I've read of the contests, is just about what such tests would require. Oddly enough, I haven't seen the contests admitting a demonstration using a RNG.

Furthermore, just as a side-note, while I would be rather surprised to find a professional skeptic admit to the existence of psi under any circumstances (including being telekinetically thrown out a window Cheesy ), I would be particularly surprised to find a professional skeptic admit to the existence of psi under circumstances in which it causes them to lose some vast sum of money. They become, due to the inherent nature of the contest, an interested party. Cheesy

In either case, don't let me disrupt this smashing arguement. The ability of both sides to find legions of citations awes me Smiley.

« Last Edit: July 19, 2006, 03:45:11 PM by Zake »      Logged

Act; for the universe will never forget your movement, nor will it ever forgive your stillness.

DownRodeo

DD-APPROVED! A-OKAYH!!

Veritas Furniture

\*\*\*\*

Posts: 498

Karma: -1

Veritas Furniture

[View Profile WWW](#)

Re: New level of skepticm

« Reply #113 on: July 19, 2006, 05:20:25 PM »

Quote from: Rafnul on July 19, 2006, 01:37:10 PM

I think you didn't understand what I just said. I said, psi IS the Unknown cause. There aren't any inherent assumptions made about psi. We have simply named the unknown

factor psi. The fact of the matter is, by some unknown mechanism, the results have deviated from chance. We named that mechanism psi. Now, the reason why they point at "psychic" abilities is because that would appear to be a "solution" which fits the bill. No one is saying the results prove psychic abilities. The results prove that there exists a deviation from chance beyond that which is expected. Once more, that deviation itself, is psi. "Psions" as opposed to parapsychologists or members of other fields are only interested in coming to understand that deviation and how it might be controlled or amplified. Those of us who are looking for truth aren't being pretentious nutballs about it and assuming that it must be specific agents that it occurs. Instead, we devote our time to trying to figure by what agent we might be able to influence this deviation. Hence, you get wild theories and speculation, until we come to something that fits the bill, and then we operate under the assumption that it may be the case, in so far that we are able to grow in understanding and influence with it.

Well said sir. I do however feel that the volume of tests we can do in this area will never be enough to prove anything either way, we've just got to keep hammering away at it all to find out what really is going on, instead of making blind inferences based upon tests that "some other dude" did Wink

« Last Edit: July 20, 2006, 05:59:32 AM by DownRodeo »      Logged

"There's a time when the operation of the machine becomes so odious, makes you so sick at heart, that you can't take part, you can't even passively take part, and you've got to put your bodies on the gears and upon the wheels, upon the levers... and you've got to make it stop!"

Mario Savio

Black

Black SnaX

Veritas Furniture

\*\*\*\*

Posts: 253

Karma: 1

No Fixed Abode

[View Profile](#)

Re: New level of skepticism

« Reply #114 on: July 23, 2006, 06:24:32 PM »

Been reading through, and I was about to post exactly what Rafnul just wrote...

Personally I don't care what has been proven or not, I don't pretend to understand exactly what mechanisms allow me to do some of the things that 'psi' can do, I have my theories, but I don't assume to know anything, proof or no proof. The fact remains that here are some things that I can do with 'psi' which consistently work. I can 'build'

something with my mind, give it all kinds of random properties, and someone else who I've never even met can tell me what I did, right down to the details. This has happened hundreds of times so I am beyond wondering if it's 'real' and now more interested in HOW it works, because it does, and the best way to increase the efficiency and utility of these abilities is to understand the mechanisms behind them.

If there are any arguments about the existence of these abilities, it should be what is and is not possible with 'psi', not about the existence of 'psi'.

Logged  
Ominous Latin phrase  
Grimmjow  
A Familiar Feature  
\*\*\*

Posts: 162  
Karma: 0

Truth Trekker

[View Profile](#)

Re: New level of skepticism  
« Reply #115 on: July 12, 2008, 01:26:17 AM »  
I wonder what happened to MachineChimera...

I guess he couldn't argue anymore...

Anyone know what happened to him?

« Last Edit: July 12, 2008, 01:36:21 AM by Grimmjow »      Logged  
Steve  
Posts By Osmosis  
\*\*\*\*\*  
Posts: 3096  
Karma: 64

[View Profile](#)

Re: New level of skepticism  
« Reply #116 on: July 12, 2008, 08:31:13 AM »  
\*comes back inside from the backyard, covered in dirt and carrying a shovel\*

Uh, I guess he left town >\_>

~Steve

Logged

Mastery does not occur when you've performed a feat once or twice. Instead, it comes after years of training, when you realize that you no longer notice when you're performing a feat which used to require so much effort. Even walking takes years of training for a human: why not everything else?

kobok

Veritas Council

Tech Team

Posts By Osmosis

\*\*\*\*\*

Posts: 4743

Karma: 148

Veritas Council

[View Profile](#)

Re: New level of skepticism

« Reply #117 on: July 12, 2008, 11:23:54 AM »

Quote from: Grimmjow on July 12, 2008, 01:26:17 AM

I wonder what happened to MachineChimera...

I guess he couldn't argue anymore...

Anyone know what happened to him?

According to his "last active" time, he returned at the appropriate time to read the replies to him posted here, and then gave up on responding.

This is not surprising, since he did not find what he expected to find here. He waltzed in thinking he had superior reasoning ability to everyone else, and that everyone else was lost in delusion. This was the basis for the majority of his argument, but it kept conflicting with reality. Ad hominem attacks against researchers do not get one very far. And there are only so many times one can argue about the basic principles of scientific experimentation and statistical analysis, when this information is all publicly available in textbooks.

Logged

solstice

Dreamwalker

Posts By Osmosis

\*\*\*\*\*

Posts: 2114

Karma: -6

"Receive and transmit..."

[View Profile](#)

Re: New level of skepticm

« Reply #118 on: July 12, 2008, 01:53:50 PM »

He's probably... tried-up \*zing\*.

Logged

Tell all the Truth but tell it slant: Success in Circuit lies. Too bright for our infirm Delight. The Truth's superb surprise. As Lightning to the Children eased, with explanation kind. The Truth must dazzle gradually, or every man be blind.

Tefeari: The Giant Impact Hypothesis is a theory

Grimmjow

A Familiar Feature

\*\*\*

Posts: 162

Karma: 0

Truth Trekker

[View Profile](#)

Re: New level of skepticm

« Reply #119 on: July 12, 2008, 01:56:14 PM »

I do like how he says he used to read into the occult or whatever as a teen and said he then became more "logical" and all that. I guess to him, reading occult stuff and never experimenting with it is enough to call it "illogical". But seriously, it's illogical for him to say something is not true without even experimenting with it. He only said he read things about the occult and whatnot; he never said he tried any of it. rolleyes

Logged

Pages: 1 ... 6 7 [8] 9Print

« previous next »

Jump to:

=> Main Hall

Machines

Oxygen design by Bloc    Valid XHTML 1.0! Valid CSS!  
<http://forums.vrsociety.net/index.php/topic%2C8667.120.html>

2 captures

7 Jul 2010 - 25 Apr 2013

Jul    APR    May

25

2010   2013   2014

About this capture

The Veritas Society

\*

\*HomeForumsChatHelpSearchRetroLoginRegister

Welcome, Guest. Please login or register.

Did you miss your activation email?

April 24, 2013, 11:25:34 PM

Forever

Login with username, password and session length

Search:

Advanced search

207187 Posts in 14721 Topics by 18394 Members - Latest Member: - NEYTiffan Most  
online today: 94 - most online ever: 430 (June 28, 2007, 02:58:51 PM)

+ The Veritas Society

|-+ The Auditorium

||-+ Main Hall

||-+ New level of skepticism    0 Members and 1 Guest are viewing this topic. «  
previous next »

Pages: 1 ... 7 8 [9]    Print

Author    Topic: New level of skepticism    (Read 15038 times)

solstice

Dreamwalker

Posts By Osmosis

\*\*\*\*\*

Posts: 2114

Karma: -6

"Receive and transmit..."



[View Profile](#)

Re: New level of skepticm

« Reply #120 on: July 12, 2008, 02:04:11 PM »

What brought you to this dusty thread?

His Myspace says he's married (when he was single before), and is still in the Marines. My guess is that he's caught up in real life stuff, and no longer cares enough to bother us further.

Logged

Tell all the Truth but tell it slant: Success in Circuit lies. Too bright for our infirm Delight. The Truth's superb surprise. As Lightning to the Children eased, with explanation kind. The Truth must dazzle gradually, or every man be blind.

Tefeari: The Giant Impact Hypothesis is a theory

Grimmjow

A Familiar Feature

\*\*\*

Posts: 162

Karma: 0

Truth Trekker

[View Profile](#)

Re: New level of skepticm

« Reply #121 on: July 12, 2008, 02:07:15 PM »

Quote from: solstice on July 12, 2008, 02:04:11 PM

What brought you to this dusty thread?

His Myspace says he's married (when he was single before), and is still in the Marines. My guess is that he's caught up in real life stuff, and no longer cares enough to bother us further.

I was at the main page of the site and I searched in the significant topics thing and found this topic.

Logged

Pages: 1 ... 7 8 [9] [Print](#)

« previous next »

Jump to:

=> [Main Hall](#)

Powered by MySQL Powered by PHP Powered by SMF 1.1.18 | SMF © 2013, Simple Machines

Oxygen design by Bloc Valid XHTML 1.0! Valid CSS!

<http://forums.v society.net/index.php?topic=9311.0>

7 captures

7 Jul 2010 - 18 Jul 2014

Sep JUL Aug

18

2013 2014 2015

About this capture

The Veritas Society

\*

\*HomeForumsChatHelpSearchRetroLoginRegister

Welcome, Guest. Please login or register.

Did you miss your activation email?

July 18, 2014, 02:16:00 AM

Forever

Login with username, password and session length

Search:

Advanced search

214972 Posts in 15322 Topics by 19763 Members - Latest Member: - ksyahu Most  
online today: 115 - most online ever: 430 (June 28, 2007, 02:58:51 PM)

+ The Veritas Society

|-+ The Auditorium

| |-+ Main Hall

|| |-+ Tackling the Occult Proof Barrier 0 Members and 1 Guest are viewing this topic.

« previous next »

Pages: [1] 2 Print

Author Topic: Tackling the Occult Proof Barrier (Read 3633 times)

ThiefDeath

Posting chief

Posts By Osmosis

\*\*\*\*\*

Posts: 1544

Karma: 4

Grammaton Cleric

[View Profile](#)

Tackling the Occult Proof Barrier

« on: October 04, 2006, 10:44:03 PM »

For many years this community has exhibited a severe lack of proof regarding psionic skills and psionic methodologies. Capable psion after capable psion have made elaborately written excuses and reasons not to provide any kind of proof. However if you study any of these reasons closely enough, and eliminate all the bull, I believe it all boils down to one factor: We don't currently have any way to efficiently and convincingly provide this type of proof.

Let's face it: If we were all in person sitting in a room together, and one person claimed he could teach you how to spin a psiwheel, there would probably be a number of people who would ask him to show them his skill. The teacher would then probably have no problem proudly showing them a small demonstration not only because it would boost his self esteem but because it would intrigue everyone, increase their motivation and willingness to learn, demonstrate the proper way to perform the skill, and verify that he clearly has the credentials to teach them and won't waste their time. I know this from experience because this is the way people act regarding most skills in social situations in person and I don't believe psionics would be any different. Now take this same situation online. Suddenly everyone "doesn't have the equipment", "shouldn't have to waste their time for you", "isn't obligated to provide you with proof", "isn't going to do it because you probably won't believe it anyway", "can't prove it to you in a tangible way", or tells you "you'd be better off providing proof to yourself".

So why all the sudden has the willingness and enthusiasm to provide demonstrations gone away? Well you could formulate an infinite amount of excuses such as the ones listed above which can be easily argued against for the most part, or you could take a logical standpoint, view the larger picture, and realize the obvious truth right in front of you: It simply isn't nearly as easy to provide the proof to someone across the globe over a computer network as it is to physically provide the proof to the person right next to you. Instead of a quick 5 second demonstration you have a big hassle with getting the right equipment, setting it up, trying to perform in such a way that most of the environmental factors can be seen and eliminated, finding a place to publish your proof, and dealing with the inevitable group of people that will claim it was faked. In this situation most people simply don't find the effort to be worth the reward. It becomes a matter of either the person doesn't want to go through all the hassle or they don't have the capability/technology. However, in order to conceal selfishness or not present an image of incompetency, an unrelated excuse will probably be made up.

Now the purpose of this thread is not so I can rant and debate about people who don't give psionic proof - I've already done that enough in several other threads. Rather, I'd

like to try to find a way for people to easily provide demonstrations. I want you to all put your heads to together and figure out how to break this hassle-barrier so a normal healthy education cycle which includes proof and demonstrations can be resumed. There has to be some way that someone who is competent can easily demonstrate their skills to the community and that anyone who has a skill will be passively encouraged to present it rather than feeling they have some sort of unwarranted demand placed on them. The method by which this is done may not be apparent to us now (which makes demonstrations appear to be highly impractical), but I'm sure with enough brainstorming, discussion, and teamwork, we can figure something out. If you have any ideas please post them here and feel free to discuss the ideas of others.

Logged

[23:48] <DanielH> You guys are all strange

[23:48] <DanielH> You have a different way of thinking (which is wrong)

How about a shave?

Big Boss

Friggen Crazy

Posts By Osmosis

\*\*\*\*\*

Posts: 1458

Karma: 3

Owner of 100000 V-Points

[View Profile WWW](#)

Re: Tackling the Occult Proof Barrier

« Reply #1 on: October 05, 2006, 01:08:44 AM »

I, too, have been a bit frustrated by the lack of proof, even though I have proven it to myself on multiple occasions, I could have saved myself alot of time making actual improvement rather than practicing kamehamehas. Even though I don't doubt the abilities of many people, I still really would have appreciated some more... "proven" methods of practice.

now, there are a few ways I would accept evidence as proof. I'd love a real, physical, right in front of me demo, but that's not likely to happen. a webcam would be my next choice. They're like what... 15 bucks? anybody with a USB port can use it. simple. The one problem with that is some people aren't willing to pay, and some people don't have a good enough internet connection to broadcast. The next would be a recorded video on youtube or myspace, but it would have to be way better than the ones currently on either of those sites. a free roaming camera is probably first on the list of things to have in your video. Makes doctoring really hard. Also, you would need to set up the control.

so if you're doing a psi wheel demo, you need to have footage of it NOT MOVING, so that when it does move, you can claim it as your own doing. also, it must be in an airtight container to be really valid. Sure, people will still dispute it, but it's better than your standard open-air, can't see under the table thing.

If you're trying to demonstrate something other than PK, I'd suggest simple number guessing. I did it with my brother once or twice when we were first starting out. I focused on a number between one and ten, and for awhile we were guessing with an alarming accuracy. Of course, we had to rely on the honor system.

Most people here on the forums use some form of instant messaging. a simple system can be set up with a three way conversation. Have one person be the middle man. the other two are "transmitting numbers" to eachother. so person A tells person C that the number is say, 6. Then person A transmitts the number to person B, who will then say what they thought the number was. if B says 4, then A can't say "correct" because person C knows it was wrong. The three of them can tally up the numbers and write down the methods they used, and if enough people were to experiment with different methods and calculate the accuracy using them, then specific methods that bring about the most success could be pinpointed and elaborated on. I think that could be very beneficial to psi practitioners all over.

I'm no expert, but I don't think tangible and strong evidence is that difficult to attain, so I don't see why we shouldn't work to do a little bit for everyone.

Logged

Join my Folding@Home team and do some good! #159490

Details at <http://folding.stanford.edu/>

Zake

Veritas Staff

Veritas Moderator

Posts By Osmosis

\*\*\*\*\*

Posts: 1722

Karma: 1

Veritas Staff

View Profile

Re: Tackling the Occult Proof Barrier

« Reply #2 on: October 05, 2006, 10:30:46 AM »

Proving receptive abilities is straightforward (even moreso than if a bunch of people

were just sitting in a room)- the teacher simply scans the student and tells him what he's wearing, what he had for breakfast, his environment, whatever. Something could easily be found which is variable enough to be decent proof. I'm pretty sure we have at least a few people around who claimed to have a reasonably reliable accuracy rate.

Logged

Act; for the universe will never forget your movement, nor will it ever forgive your stillness.

kakkarot

0. The Fool... Inverted?

Posts By Osmosis

\*\*\*\*\*

Posts: 2701

Karma: 3

Pirate "Not-A-Mod" BoB

View Profile

Re: Tackling the Occult Proof Barrier

« Reply #3 on: October 05, 2006, 10:43:14 AM »

The problem then falls on availability of accomplished practitioners who can provide proof versus the millions of people out there who want this proof. After even just a short time it becomes quite tedious and harrowing to have to provide proof for every Tom, Dick, and Jane who shows up on the forums or chat asking for (or simply demanding) proof that they're willing to accept.

How would this problem be dealt with? Simple pinwheel videos are already available via psipog and veritas, so what other solutions are there to a dozen people a day showing up and demanding real time undeniable proof?

EDIT: It seems even google video has some vids

<http://video.google.com/videoplay?docid=8786430663470284545&q=psi>

~kakkarot

« Last Edit: October 05, 2006, 10:46:29 AM by kakkarot »      Logged

Philippians 2:5 Your attitude should be the same as that of Christ Jesus: 6 Who, being in very nature God, did not consider equality with God something to be grasped, 7 but made himself nothing, taking the very nature of a servant, being made in human likeness.

Big Boss

Friggen Crazy

Posts By Osmosis

\*\*\*\*\*

Posts: 1458

Karma: 3

Owner of 100000 V-Points

View Profile WWW

Re: Tackling the Occult Proof Barrier

« Reply #4 on: October 05, 2006, 11:29:41 AM »

the problem with vids like that kak, is that they're too easy to doctor/fake. that one right there is a good example of a bad video because it was done in two shots. the first one with the water being poured out, and the second, where there was likely no water in the can and instead, a small magnet. That of course is my skeptical side. Smiley

The problem with scans, as Zake mentioned, is that hoards of people want them, and won't take a testimonial for an answer. Is there a way to make a testimonial more than a simple "yes, it's true."?

Logged

Join my Folding@Home team and do some good! #159490

Details at <http://folding.stanford.edu/>

Rafnul!

he-who-posts-lots

Veritas Moderator

Posts By Osmosis

\*\*\*\*\*

Posts: 1081

Karma: 28

View Profile

Re: Tackling the Occult Proof Barrier

« Reply #5 on: October 05, 2006, 01:18:24 PM »

A high definition video, with an entire room in view, from 16 different camera angles, with a piece of paper inside of glass box melted shut on site and video taped, and submerged in water, thermometers kept in 24 different places in the water to monitor unusual activity. No human being can be in the same room as the toothpick and the

glass case, including the psion. Room is closed after the filmed setup is completed. There must be cameras on all cameras so that we can see behind. The entire of stream of video must be uninterrupted for all cameras. An aerial thermograph should be taken for the entire period of the experiment as well. Psion must perform the experiment blind, or from behind a glass window .

Logged

kakkarot

0. The Fool... Inverted?

Posts By Osmosis

\*\*\*\*\*

Posts: 2701

Karma: 3

Pirate "Not-A-Mod" BoB

[View Profile](#)

Re: Tackling the Occult Proof Barrier

« Reply #6 on: October 05, 2006, 01:20:17 PM »

Therein lies the problem, as I mentioned: thousands of people want direct personal proof, merely dozens at veritas could/would provide it over such a flimsy medium as the internet.

As always, however, the best proof is the proof a person finds for themselves. If a person desires to learn to actually achieve these results, there are plenty of articles by kobok, prophecy, and others which tons of people have used to achieve their own personal proofs. If a person is just looking to cause trouble by claiming we can't provide proof, then let them claim all they want. I know what I do is real, I have no impetus to prove it to others. I learned on my own, others can learn as well (and unlike in my own life where I had no teacher yet still was able to learn, there are teachers here at veritas who are willing to teach people, and from whom many have been given more proof than they ever would have needed).

So if people want to still try to give individual, personal proof to every person that comes here, I'll not stop them. That's up to the individuals who wish to give such proofs. And good luck to you all, for if you succeed in your endeavors then you have taken a strong step forward.

~kakkarot

Logged

Philippians 2:5 Your attitude should be the same as that of Christ Jesus: 6 Who, being in very nature God, did not consider equality with God something to be grasped, 7 but



made himself nothing, taking the very nature of a servant, being made in human likeness.

kobok

Veritas Council

Tech Team

Posts By Osmosis

\*\*\*\*\*

Posts: 4891

Karma: 158

Veritas Council

[View Profile](#)

Re: Tackling the Occult Proof Barrier

« Reply #7 on: October 05, 2006, 02:05:54 PM »

Quote from: Martial Thoughts on October 05, 2006, 01:08:44 AM

If you're trying to demonstrate something other than PK, I'd suggest simple number guessing. I did it with my brother once or twice when we were first starting out. I focused on a number between one and ten, and for awhile we were guessing with an alarming accuracy. Of course, we had to rely on the honor system.

I've seen this type of evidence accumulated countless times around here. Many students of the psi courses have done similar, and I've seen a handful of people successfully doing similar exercises in the practice channel.

The question is, what good is it to those who are looking for proof? Does it help if we document it? Like you say, it requires the honor system. You could easily pm the answers and cheat if you were so inclined, so it only really works as "proof" to the people who are actually taking part in it, since they know they aren't cheating, or to those who trust them. So then it becomes a volume problem. Do you "guess the number" for a few hundred people a day as each person wants a personal demonstration?

There are only two ways I know of to package this sort of information for distribution to the masses. The first is to teach people how to do it so they can do it themselves. The second is scientific studies, which themselves require trusting the honesty of scientists, as with any science. If you find a third method, by all means, speak up.

Quote from: ThiefDeath

Rather, I'd like to try to find a way for people to easily provide demonstrations. ... There has to be some way that someone who is competent can easily demonstrate their

skills to the community and that anyone who has a skill will be passively encouraged to present it rather than feeling they have some sort of unwarranted demand placed on them.

Quote from: Martial Thoughts

the problem with vids like that kak, is that they're too easy to doctor/fake.

Quote from: Rafnul

A high definition video, with an entire room in view, from 16 different camera angles, with a piece of paper inside of glass box melted shut on site and video taped, and submerged in water, thermometers kept in 24 different places in the water to monitor unusual activity. No human being can be in the same room as the toothpick and the glass case, including the psion. Room is closed after the filmed setup is completed. There must be cameras on all cameras so that we can see behind. The entire of stream of video must be uninterrupted for all cameras. An aerial thermograph should be taken for the entire period of the experiment as well. Psion must perform the experiment blind, or from behind a glass window.

That's the natural progression of thought that seems to go on with videos.

1. Video asked for, it's pointed out that webcams are cheap and easy.
2. Webcam video provided.
3. Video critiqued, many times with valid critiques, given the natural limit of information available with any video or demonstration setup.
4. Suggestion made for astronomically challenging conditions for a video of a demonstration.

And of course, if someone were to accomplish the conditions of number 4, number 3 would naturally repeat as a video or collection of videos can of course never address all possible criticisms. Many people simply skip step 2 since steps 3 and 4 are obvious.

As I wrote at the bottom of this page on our wiki, "In a modern society in which nearly anything can be rendered on screen in a large budget movie, videos alone cannot constitute proof. Therefore, these are not intended to be, nor presented as, proof. They are merely a few demonstrations provided in response to frequent request. These videos are presented with honest intent, and to the best of our knowledge they are genuine demonstrations of the stated abilities."

So in my opinion, the problem originates with what's asked for. So before you can brainstorm about how to gather "occult proof", you need to sit down and brainstorm what would constitute sufficient "occult proof" for the target audience.

Logged

Latest article: Construct Dynamics

Want to learn psi? Check out our collection of psi articles.

ThiefDeath

Posting chief  
Posts By Osmosis

\*\*\*\*\*

Posts: 1544  
Karma: 4

Grammaton Cleric

[View Profile](#)

Re: Tackling the Occult Proof Barrier

« Reply #8 on: October 05, 2006, 03:11:55 PM »

Keep in mind I'm asking for ALL ideas on how to provide proof and demonstrations, not just recorded videos. Think outside the box.

Logged

[23:48] <DanielH> You guys are all strange

[23:48] <DanielH> You have a different way of thinking (which is wrong)

How about a shave?

Vecna

Heartless Admin

Tech Team

Posts By Osmosis

\*\*\*\*\*

Posts: 983  
Karma: 11

The Silence Between the Void

[View Profile](#)

Re: Tackling the Occult Proof Barrier

« Reply #9 on: October 05, 2006, 03:32:28 PM »

Quote from: ThiefDeath on October 05, 2006, 03:11:55 PM

Keep in mind I'm asking for ALL ideas on how to provide proof and demonstrations, not just recorded videos. Think outside the box.

I'll encourage thinking outside the box, when I see evidence of thinking inside the box...

~Crowley  
Logged

Arinil  
Veritas Furniture  
\*\*\*\*

Posts: 347  
Karma: 0

Aspirant of the Wood

[View Profile](#)

Re: Tackling the Occult Proof Barrier

« Reply #10 on: October 05, 2006, 06:04:59 PM »

Proof is indeed often necessary for those who wish to learn and need somewhat of a validation that what they will be spending their time and hard study on, but those who randomly appear and demand or even ask for proof have no need in my mind to be granted us wasting our time and effort to accomodate them. We should focus on proof for people who are sincerely interested in and have an at least basic belief of the things they are requesting proof of, which does not remotely suggest they have no skepticism on the subject; as blind belief is as harmful as blind denial. Anways...the point is that maybe the proof could be less sophisticated in some cases if some comprehension of the basic principals of what is occuring could further the understanding that the act is actually happening? This just opens the door for less traditional proof methods in my mind, and I thought hope my thoughts might prove helpful. Smiley

Logged

Whoever knows everything but himself, lacks everything. (Th 3)

Raitaro  
Posts By Osmosis  
\*\*\*\*\*

Posts: 2151  
Karma: 0

The Knight of Wands

[View Profile](#)

Re: Tackling the Occult Proof Barrier

« Reply #11 on: October 06, 2006, 08:08:53 AM »

Well when I get some noticeable skill (I'm working on some basic Clairvoyance tricks right now) I'll gladly do a webcam group session with people.

Logged

The IneptInitiate

<http://xkcd.com/303/>

<http://xkcd.com/123/>

I got a hot girl and the coolest band I know. I gotta bad habbit of smoking before the show.

I got music I got friends I trust and love. I get into a lot of fights and now my knuckles are all fucked up.....

vortex

Settling In

\*

Posts: 12

Karma: 0

[View Profile](#)

Re: Tackling the Occult Proof Barrier

« Reply #12 on: November 01, 2006, 11:33:20 AM »

Sorry guys, but i think that skepticism will rule over those methods. Watch the example of free energy, we already have devices capable of producing it but, since there is no scientific explanation for the process , it's totally dismissed (except by the American army). <--See the documentary Equinox free energy , broadcasted in 1995, or do some research on Tesla.

So I'm tackling the problem from a different point of view, can the human brain deal with other kinds of energy not counting electrical?

I am currently taking higher electronics, with special interest on magnetic and electrical fields, with intentions on continuing with neuro-technology to see if this is the case.

And even if it can you would still have to prove how.....

The infamous Vericow!

Logged

Ephemeral

Settling In

\*

Posts: 32

Karma: 0

[View Profile](#)

Re: Tackling the Occult Proof Barrier

« Reply #13 on: November 23, 2006, 12:40:26 PM »

I know this may sound a bit outlandish, but I have the most obvious solution to eliminating all skepticism. Host a all day meeting somewhere, and invite people from the veritas community. Those who are nearby will come, and we can have a seminar where people demonstrate their abilities, and key leaders like kobok and prophecy can lecture or explain different magick/psi techniques. There are obvious problems with this idea, namely travel distance. However, it's worth considering.

Logged

<http://www.philosophy-forums.com>

`Nazukarr

Posts By Osmosis

\*\*\*\*\*

Posts: 627

Karma: 15

[View Profile](#)

Re: Tackling the Occult Proof Barrier

« Reply #14 on: November 23, 2006, 03:49:05 PM »

As great as that idea sound, I think it should wait a few years. Wink

Logged

"I am not this hair, I am not this skin, I am the soul that lives within."

Pages: [1] 2 Print

« previous next »

Jump to:

=> Main Hall

Powered by MySQL Powered by PHP Powered by SMF 1.1.19 | SMF © 2013, Simple Machines

Oxygen design by Bloc Valid XHTML 1.0! Valid CSS!

<http://forums.v society.net/index.php?topic=9415.0>

6 captures

7 Jul 2010 - 18 Jul 2014

Sep JUL Aug  
18  
2013 2014 2015

About this capture  
The Veritas Society

\*

\*HomeForumsChatHelpSearchRetroLoginRegister  
Welcome, Guest. Please login or register.  
Did you miss your activation email?  
July 18, 2014, 02:18:09 AM

Forever

Login with username, password and session length  
Search:

Advanced search

214972 Posts in 15322 Topics by 19763 Members - Latest Member: - ksyahu Most  
online today: 115 - most online ever: 430 (June 28, 2007, 02:58:51 PM)

+ The Veritas Society

|-+ The Auditorium

| |-+ Main Hall

|| |-+ Psionic Proof Compilation 0 Members and 1 Guest are viewing this topic. «  
previous next »

Pages: [1] Print

Author Topic: Psionic Proof Compilation (Read 3724 times)

ThiefDeath

Posting chief

Posts By Osmosis

\*\*\*\*\*

Posts: 1544

Karma: 4

Grammaton Cleric

View Profile

Psionic Proof Compilation

« on: October 21, 2006, 01:03:52 PM »

I want an easy all-in-one place to refer people to when they ask me for proof of psionics.

Everyone who knows of a link to a good video, a scientific document, a large convincing argument, or anything else which could be considered proof of psionics, regardless of whether or not it could be called fake (unless you know it IS fake), please post it here.

« Last Edit: October 21, 2006, 01:11:33 PM by ThiefDeath » Logged

[23:48] <DanielH> You guys are all strange

[23:48] <DanielH> You have a different way of thinking (which is wrong)

How about a shave?

Forg

The V' Smithy

Posts By Osmosis

\*\*\*\*\*

Posts: 827

Karma: 20

[View Profile](#)

Re: Psionic Proof Compilation

« Reply #1 on: October 21, 2006, 03:06:41 PM »

Trial and experience.

Logged

Be your own light, your own refuge. Believe only that which you test for yourself. Do not accept authority merely because it comes from a great man, or is written in a sacred book, for truth is different for each man and woman." -- Buddha

Philosopher

Veritas Furniture

\*\*\*\*

Posts: 316

Karma: 0

Bah.

[View Profile](#)

Re: Psionic Proof Compilation



« Reply #2 on: October 21, 2006, 03:55:19 PM »  
How exactly do you refer people to that Forg?

The telekinesis videos here on Veritas are pretty good. On a more scientific level, Dean Radin presents a pretty convincing statistical case, but I don't know how much will be available on line.

Logged  
ChezNips  
Veritas Teacher  
Teacher Emeritus  
Posts By Osmosis  
\*\*\*\*\*

Posts: 1722  
Karma: 7

[View Profile](#)

Re: Psionic Proof Compilation

« Reply #3 on: October 21, 2006, 04:26:28 PM »

I would point people to R.J. Rhine and his work at Duke university that put psi on the proverbial map.

<http://www.rhine.org/>

Jessica Utss paper on The Paranormal: the Evidence and its Implications for Consciousness

<http://www.tcm.phy.cam.ac.uk/~bdj10/psi/tucson.psi>

Princeton Engineering Anomalies Research:

<http://www.princeton.edu/~pear/>

Biomind Superpowers:

<http://www.biomindsuperpowers.com/>

<http://www.rviewer.com/IngoSwann-ResearchOverview.html>

I could probably list another dozen if you needed

There are some names in particular that have done research for many years including Russell Targ and Hal Puthoff

[http://www.parapsych.org/members/h\\_puthoff.html](http://www.parapsych.org/members/h_puthoff.html)

Various random links for psi research:

<http://moebius.psy.ed.ac.uk/>

<http://www.noetic.org/>

Logged  
some days you're the bug, some days you're the windshield.

Forg

The V' Smithy

Posts By Osmosis

\*\*\*\*\*

Posts: 827

Karma: 20

[View Profile](#)

Re: Psionic Proof Compilation

« Reply #4 on: October 21, 2006, 04:31:08 PM »

Quote from: Philosopher on October 21, 2006, 03:55:19 PM

How exactly do you refer people to that Forg?

By simply presenting them that they can try the material they find in order to see if it works for them.

Currently I don't have any outside videos other than the ones we have on the site, and I don't have very many links to parapsychology material and statistics. And outside of that, I'm not quite sure how to post 'proof' for the many abilities that don't have a physical counterpart outside of an observational answer.

« Last Edit: October 21, 2006, 04:33:33 PM by Forg » Logged

Be your own light, your own refuge. Believe only that which you test for yourself. Do not accept authority merely because it comes from a great man, or is written in a sacred book, for truth is different for each man and woman." -- Buddha

ThiefDeath

Posting chief

Posts By Osmosis

\*\*\*\*\*

Posts: 1544

Karma: 4

Grammaton Cleric

[View Profile](#)

Re: Psionic Proof Compilation

« Reply #5 on: October 21, 2006, 05:27:39 PM »

Most likely if a skeptic, someone practicing radki, or someone who is considering whether or not to start psionics asks me for proof that psionics works, "try it yourself" isn't going to be a very convincing answer. These people are looking to see something BEFORE they commit the long hours to studying and practicing. Some of the people I discuss this subject may not even be interested in practicing psionics themselves at all, so the possibility that they could achieve results themselves would be irrelevant. I'm looking for objective evidence. Objective evidence may not be possible for ALL psionic skills but it is possible for many and I'm looking for as much as I can get.

Thank you Star and Philosopher.

Logged

[23:48] <DanielH> You guys are all strange

[23:48] <DanielH> You have a different way of thinking (which is wrong)

How about a shave?

ShadowStriker

Regular Member

A Familiar Feature

\*\*\*

Posts: 228

Karma: 0

All Around WTF

[View Profile](#)

Re: Psionic Proof Compilation

« Reply #6 on: October 21, 2006, 08:46:14 PM »

well, i think you should tell them where to find a really powerful Psion, have them go over there, have them us PK to rise a soda can up and smack em upside the head. I know its not a likely thing to happen, but it'd be funny as hell grin

Logged

The Strong Take From the Weak, The Smart Take From The Strong, The Quick Take From The Smart, And The Weak Rise Up Against Them All

Kettle

Frequent poster

Veritas Teacher

Veritas Furniture

\*\*\*\*\*

Posts: 376

Karma: 20

Frequent poster

[View Profile](#)

Re: Psionic Proof Compilation

« Reply #7 on: October 21, 2006, 09:21:10 PM »

Quote

I want an easy all-in-one place to refer people to when they ask me for proof of psionics.

Ya, that came out in 97' and it's called 'The Concious Universe : The scientific Truth of Psychic Phenomena' by Dean Radin which basically does exactly what you are wanting to do. It's all very well put together too, presenting a solid basis behind the reality of psychic phenomena.

It's not a 'how to' guide, but but it contains some fairly undeniable evidence.

That should basically cover it.

-k

Logged

Raitaro

Posts By Osmosis

\*\*\*\*\*

Posts: 2151

Karma: 0

The Knight of Wands

View Profile

Re: Psionic Proof Compilation

« Reply #8 on: October 22, 2006, 07:25:21 AM »

I intend to make a short video by Christmas using a pre-cog/scanning technique, what kind of things could I do to show its not fake?

Logged

The IneptInitiate

<http://xkcd.com/303/>

<http://xkcd.com/123/>

I got a hot girl and the coolest band I know. I gotta bad habbit of smoking before the show.

I got music I got friends I trust and love. I get into a lot of fights and now my knuckles are all fucked up.....

Athiril

Reverend Lucious

Veritas Furniture

\*\*\*\*

Posts: 469

Karma: 0

View Profile WWW

Re: Psionic Proof Compilation

« Reply #9 on: October 22, 2006, 07:31:14 AM »

Quote from: Raitaro on October 22, 2006, 07:25:21 AM

I intend to make a short video by Christmas using a pre-cog/scanning technique, what

kind of things could I do to show its not fake?

it'd be impossible, because whatever you do could be scripted.

Logged  
photodan.com.au  
Forg  
The V' Smithy  
Posts By Osmosis  
\*\*\*\*\*  
Posts: 827  
Karma: 20

[View Profile](#)

Re: Psionic Proof Compilation

« Reply #10 on: October 22, 2006, 07:49:53 AM »

Quote from: ThiefDeath on October 21, 2006, 05:27:39 PM

Most likely if a skeptic, someone practicing radki, or someone who is considering whether or not to start psionics asks me for proof that psionics works, "try it yourself" isn't going to be a very convincing answer. These people are looking to see something BEFORE they commit the long hours to studying and practicing. Some of the people I discuss this subject may not even be interested in practicing psionics themselves at all, so the possibility that they could achieve results themselves would be irrelevant. I'm looking for objective evidence. Objective evidence may not be possible for ALL psionic skills but it is possible for many and I'm looking for as much as I can get.

Thank you Star and Philosopher.

Yes, which is why I mentioned the evidence that comes simply from a question and answer point of view that would be provided via telepathy, psychic reading, scanning, remote viewing and so forth. In such circumstances when needed I would provide evidence using my own ability to the questioner. But I don't think a video including any of such things would be of much proof considering how easy it is to say that it's fake. The best evidence I've ever seen is on a one to one basis, statistical study, and a few TK videos. Now TK in general can be good proof, but I find it to be one of the most useless skills. That becomes a problem when people start asking, "Okay, so what's the point?"

In either case, what I can provide is only a tk video, my own experience on a personal basis, and encouraging people who want to know to 'waste their time' if the answers aren't going to pop up in front of them. Frankly, if people aren't willing to give their time to see such proof, I don't think it's all to important that they find it.

Logged

Be your own light, your own refuge. Believe only that which you test for yourself. Do not accept authority merely because it comes from a great man, or is written in a sacred book, for truth is different for each man and woman." -- Buddha

solstice

Dreamwalker

Posts By Osmosis

\*\*\*\*\*

Posts: 2114

Karma: -4

"Receive and transmit..."

View Profile

Re: Psionic Proof Compilation

« Reply #11 on: October 22, 2006, 10:39:50 AM »

<http://vsociety.net>

Logged

Tell all the Truth but tell it slant: Success in Circuit lies. Too bright for our infirm Delight. The Truth's superb surprise. As Lightning to the Children eased, with explanation kind. The Truth must dazzle gradually, or every man be blind.

Tefeari: The Giant Impact Hypothesis is a theory

kakkarot

0. The Fool... Inverted?

Posts By Osmosis

\*\*\*\*\*

Posts: 2701

Karma: 3

Pirate "Not-A-Mod" BoB

View Profile

Re: Psionic Proof Compilation

« Reply #12 on: October 22, 2006, 11:14:14 AM »

[http://www.scientificexploration.org/jse/articles/pdf/13.1\\_kress.pdf](http://www.scientificexploration.org/jse/articles/pdf/13.1_kress.pdf) Probably one of the most important reports you'll see regarding the existence of Remote Viewing (which the

report terms "anomolous cognition"), "the Kress Report". It owns up to the fact that the CIA was testing to see whether RV exists, and concludes that while RV does exist it is not reliable enough to be used as a form of intelligence gathering. There was another report done by two others who supposedly critiqued the StarGate project as well, but those two didn't have the full access to the classified documents that Kress did.

[http://www.irva.org/papers/ParaIntel\\_Kress.html](http://www.irva.org/papers/ParaIntel_Kress.html) Another place to find it, in html for those without pdf readers.

Many good sources of information are found in books that aren't on the internet, such as "Psychic Discoveries Behind the Iron Curtain" and the followup book to that, the title of which I don't remember (something like "More Psychic Discoveries blah blah etc").

And then of course there's always, as forg said, trial and experience. learning to do these things for yourself will always trump research that other people did/do in terms of showing a person whether it's real or not.

~kakkarot

Logged

Philippians 2:5 Your attitude should be the same as that of Christ Jesus: 6 Who, being in very nature God, did not consider equality with God something to be grasped, 7 but made himself nothing, taking the very nature of a servant, being made in human likeness.

kobok

Veritas Council

Tech Team

Posts By Osmosis

\*\*\*\*\*

Posts: 4891

Karma: 158

Veritas Council

View Profile

Re: Psionic Proof Compilation

« Reply #13 on: October 23, 2006, 10:07:43 PM »

Quote from: ThiefDeath on October 21, 2006, 01:03:52 PM

I want an easy all-in-one place to refer people to when they ask me for proof of psionics.

Everyone who knows of a link to a good video, a scientific document, a large convincing argument, or anything else which could be considered proof of psionics, regardless of whether or not it could be called fake (unless you know it IS fake), please post it here.



Proof (aka, substantially solid evidence of a sufficient caliber to not be reasonably disputable): <http://vsociety.net/wiki/Parapsychology>

Particular emphasis should be given to the content of "The Conscious Universe". If attempting to construct such a site in a comprehensive fashion, it would be wise to read that book thoroughly and use its content as a guide to the distribution of evidence available. In particular, if one is searching for original data, this bibliography from said book is a reasonably comprehensive guide of data up to 1997:  
<http://www.deanradin.com/NewWeb/TCUbiblio.html>

Reasonable demonstration, with clarifiers about the non-scientific nature of such demonstrations: <http://vsociety.net/wiki/Videos>

Logged

Latest article: Construct Dynamics

Want to learn psi? Check out our collection of psi articles.

Arinil

Veritas Furniture

\*\*\*\*

Posts: 347

Karma: 0

Aspirant of the Wood

View Profile

Re: Psionic Proof Compilation

« Reply #14 on: November 21, 2006, 05:32:20 PM »

Quote

I intend to make a short video by Christmas using a pre-cog/scanning technique, what kind of things could I do to show its not fake?

With precognition, if you control it to a sufficient caliber, you could possibly use this idea to make a "proof" video.

Film as many things as you can that prove it is the day you say it is (a.k.a. The date on the TV ) so that the fact it is the time and day you say it is is completely undeniable. Make a prediction of something major that will happen the next day (cannot be anything that could be scientifically predicted such as weather, and preferably not something that is a 50/50 chance) and record yourself predicting it in the same video as the proof of the date. If it happens the next day record the proof of the date and the thing that

happened.

Logged

Whoever knows everything but himself, lacks everything. (Th 3)

Pages: [1]    Print

« previous next »

Jump to:

=> Main Hall

Powered by MySQL Powered by PHP    Powered by SMF 1.1.19 | SMF © 2013, Simple Machines

Oxygen design by Bloc    Valid XHTML 1.0! Valid CSS!

[http://vsociety.net/wiki/Miscellaneous\\_Debates](http://vsociety.net/wiki/Miscellaneous_Debates)

19 captures

6 Sep 2008 - 7 Aug 2017

Oct    AUG    Sep

07

2014    2017    2018

About this capture

Miscellaneous Debates

PageDiscussionView sourceHistory

Guide to Debating by TakeV

Eugenics

Category: Significant Forum Topics

Navigation menu

Veritas Society

Main Page

Forums

IRC chat

Recent changes

Random page

Help

Search

Search

Tools

What links here

Related changes

Special pages

Printable version

Permanent link

Page information

Create accountLog in

This page was last modified on 20 July 2007, at 15:52. [Privacy policy](#) [About Veritas](#)  
[Disclaimers](#)

Powered by MediaWiki

<http://forums.vociety.net/index.php?topic=10767.0>

4 captures

07 Jul 2010 - 17 Jul 2014

Jun JUL Aug

17

2013 2014 2015

[About this capture](#)

The Veritas Society

\*

[\\*Home](#)[Forums](#)[Chat](#)[Help](#)[Search](#)[Retro](#)[Login](#)[Register](#)

Welcome, Guest. Please login or register.

[Did you miss your activation email?](#)

July 17, 2014, 01:21:57 AM

Forever

Login with username, password and session length

Search:

[Advanced search](#)

214924 Posts in 15320 Topics by 19763 Members - Latest Member: - ksyahu Most  
online today: 103 - most online ever: 430 (June 28, 2007, 02:58:51 PM)

+ The Veritas Society

| -+ The Auditorium

| | -+ Main Hall

| | | -+ V's guide to debate (Or how to not sound like an idiot) 0 Members and 1 Guest  
are viewing this topic. « previous next »

Pages: [1] 2 [Print](#)

Author Topic: V's guide to debate (Or how to not sound like an idiot) (Read 4112  
times)

TakeV

Mad Scientist

Veritas Council

Posts By Osmosis

\*\*\*\*\*

Posts: 943

Karma: 52

[View Profile](#)

V's guide to debate (Or how to not sound like an idiot)

« on: July 01, 2007, 03:32:34 PM »

Foreword

Lately, there seems to have been a great increase in the amount of debating going on. This is a wonderful thing. A debate is not just convincing the other person that you are right, it is the exchange of ideas, viewing other viewpoints, learning facts that you may have not known previously. By using logic, reason, experience, and research, two people (as well as anyone observing) may approach one another, and leave more enriched than before.

However, this is not the case I have been observing. What I have seen is more close to arguing, with little learning going on, and all that results is inflation and defense of egos, contempt for others (and even going as far as contempt for the system the other person follows), and tempers being raised. This is quite a sad thing indeed; so much potential for growth is lost due to people simply not understanding the mechanics of how to debate in the first place.

This is the reason I have written this. I shall highlight some things I have seen going wrong. The topics will range from general debate practices, to more specific things within the occult.

The V guide to debates  
(Or how to not sound like an idiot)

## 1. Logic

### Logic

A link describing what logic is. Good background, if you need it, and you can learn about the different types of logic.

### Logical Fallacies

A site describing logical fallacies. Read it. Know them like the back of your hand. Avoid at all costs, and try to correct anyone else who makes them.

Logic is, quite frankly, the backbone of any debate. It is the map we use to reach our destination of understanding what the hell we are talking about. Now, the main problem here is one of two things. One, some don't understand logic very much, and two, some think that the occult is beyond logic. The second point is quite understandable, as we have often, in our early childhood and exposure to the media, get bombarded with the idea that magic and psi have no rules, you can do whatever you want.

Well, not exactly. You see, it turns out that both do have rules, and logic can still apply. So, I recommend that everyone here gets a firm, solid understanding of logic and reason.

## 2. Respect

Okay. You just got your argument shot down. Despite having what you thought, your point is not as concrete as you wanted it to be. Everyone is informing you that you are wrong.

What do you do?

- a) Proclaim that they are too far below your level to understand.
- b) Break out your full vocabulary of less than polite words.
- c) Nod and say you understand.
- d) Criticize one of their character traits.

(Answer: C)

Respect is an important thing in a debate. Simply, if you are too busy yelling or mocking your opponent, you are not spending any time debating. Additionally, this will hurt your public opinion, which may not seem big at first, leads to devastation in future debates. This is due to the fact that someone who is more advanced is going to have greater self-control. If this is lacking, it is not a good indicator of your credibility. And people will just hate you.

## 3. Sources

If you are going to use a point that is not in the realm of common knowledge, you had better back up your point. Again, this is just common sense, but a mistake I see often. If you are going to claim that psi energy is really made out of pink yogurt, and constructs are really sprinkles, you are going to need someone to back you up. The best way to approach this would be to have sources on hand, or easily accessible. Make sure the source is credible, thus you should avoid geocities, tripod, and the like.

Yet don't think that sources have to be so far removed. Kobok, for instance, is an authority on psionics, and he knows his way around a physics equation or two. He may be cited as a source for psionics and physics, though he needs to have actually stated

what you are saying, or needs to be asked during the debate.

#### 4. You lose, good day sir!

Yes, that quote was mandatory. But it brings us to the next point: That is the attitude of people who argue around here. A very wrong way to look at things, though. The goal of a debate isn't to prove that you know more than someone else, or to convince them to adopt your side. Sharing ideas, that is the goal of a debate. Look at it this way, if you enter a proper debate, either way you have won. If you have "lost", then that means you have learned something new. If you have "won", you have helped someone learn something new. Both sides benefit from hearing the points of the other side, and both benefit from seeing the other side's view.

#### 5. Occam's razor

Often stated as "The simplest solution tends to be the most correct one."  
However, I've always believed the original statement to be more true --

"Entities should not be multiplied beyond necessity."

All this means is don't make things more complicated than they need be. Try to stay on topic, and try not to confuse the matter by adding unnecessary points to your argument. You could be telling someone the answers to life, the universe, and everything (In non-numerical form), and if they don't understand what you are saying, nothing is gained.

#### 6. Common sense?

I really, really don't want to bring up this point, especially after the previous entires, however, it must be stated.

Just because something defies common sense doesn't mean it is false. An excellent example of this in action is quantum mechanics, if you need proof. This is an important thing to remember in both magic and psionics. If something is false according to common sense, it does not necessarily mean it is false in reality.

#### 7. Missing the forest for the trees

This is a case of not seeing the big picture for minor, inconsequential details. Remember, false facts can be stated, but unless they are going to affect the debate, just ignore them. An example, if I were to say "India, a country in Africa, has one of the largest populations on earth." Now, the topic here is what countries have high populations. Thus, the statement "a country in Africa", while false, is off topic and can be ignored. However, if I were to say "India, a country in Africa, has a large population because it is located in Africa", knock yourself out.

For more examples of this, just observe Faijer just about anytime he talks. Wink

#### 8. Missing the trees for the forest

The inverse of the above, but also a problem. This is what happens when someone only focuses on the big picture of something, but the topic of the debate is about the details of it. The best example I can give here is a personal experience.

Once, I had a debate with someone, who we shall call Mr. solstice. Myself and Mr. solstice were debating about the mechanics of magic, and how they compare to the mechanics of psionics. However, there was a problem here. Mr. solstice kept refuting my points with one point.

“Magic and psi are nothing alike because the lifestyles of a magician and a psion are nothing alike!”

Well, this does tend to be true, I have met few magicians and psions who have like lifestyles. However, the problem was, this was a moot point. How the practitioners live does not change how the mechanics of a system work. The principle of vibration holds if a magician is the CEO of a large corporation or if he is a hermit.

#### 9. Subjectivity and reality

Don't.

Just, do not go there. By starting to throw in words like subjectivity, you must have a valid point, and you must know what you are doing. Here is a little exercise, I like to call it the “V test of relevance.”

Imagine you are walking down the street, and all of a sudden, some random really strong guy comes and starts beating the bajeezes out of you. Unfortunately, all you have to defend yourself if your point. This guy is relatively intelligent, and not subject to trickery. You must use your point in a logical and reasonable train of thought to save yourself. If you can't do it, don't bring it up. If you argue that the guy doesn't exist, because your point is that nothing exists, you lose automatically.

Remember, we don't care how you twist words to make it seem like you are showing the nature of the universe.

Also avoid questions such as --

“What is true?”

“What is real?”

“Do you all exist?”

#### 10. Most importantly (In my opinion)

Know that you can be wrong.

Remember, there is a 50/50 chance of it.

## Conclusion

Well, that is about it. If I think of anymore, I will add it to the post.

I hope people will read this, and make good use of the information. Remember, a debate should be seen as a great thing, not as a headache. Smiley

« Last Edit: July 23, 2007, 09:47:27 PM by Frozen »    Logged

Sigil for focus

Best argument ever.

Jesse9209

Veritas Furniture

\*\*\*\*

Posts: 413

Karma: 20

## View Profile

Re: V's guide to debate (Or how to not sound like an idiot)

« Reply #1 on: July 01, 2007, 03:56:57 PM »

I hope people put those points into practice here. Good Article.

Logged

www.thedivinescience.org

Saer

Veritas Furniture

\*\*\*\*

Posts: 480

Karma: 3

## View Profile

Re: V's guide to debate (Or how to not sound like an idiot)

« Reply #2 on: July 01, 2007, 08:16:16 PM »



Bless your soul for this.

Logged

As you love your own body, so regard everyone as equal to your own body. When the Supreme Experience supervenes, everyone's service is revealed as one's own service. Call it a bird, an insect, an animal or a man, call it by any name you please, one serves one's own Self in every one of them. ~ Ma

solstice

Dreamwalker

Posts By Osmosis

\*\*\*\*\*

Posts: 2114

Karma: -4

"Receive and transmit..."

View Profile

Re: V's guide to debate (Or how to not sound like an idiot)

« Reply #3 on: July 01, 2007, 08:31:51 PM »

Quote

Logic is, quite frankly, the backbone of any debate.

I think may have missed something,

[http://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Reason#Reason\\_and\\_logic](http://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Reason#Reason_and_logic)

Reasoning is often confused with logic, and tends to be exercised more than logical deduction; [http://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Inductive\\_reasoning](http://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Inductive_reasoning)

« Last Edit: July 01, 2007, 08:35:04 PM by solstice »    Logged

Tell all the Truth but tell it slant: Success in Circuit lies.    Too bright for our infirm Delight. The Truth's superb surprise. As Lightning to the Children eased, with explanation kind.    The Truth must dazzle gradually, or every man be blind.

Tefeari: The Giant Impact Hypothesis is a theory

ThiefDeath

Posting chief

Posts By Osmosis

\*\*\*\*\*

Posts: 1544

Karma: 4

Grammaton Cleric

[View Profile](#)

Re: V's guide to debate (Or how to not sound like an idiot)

« Reply #4 on: July 01, 2007, 09:50:26 PM »

Quote from: TakeV on July 01, 2007, 03:32:34 PM

Kobok, for instance, is an authority on psionics, and he knows his way around a physics equation or two. He may be cited as a source for psionics and physics, though he needs to have actually stated what you are saying, or needs to be asked during the debate.

Keep in mind that even though kobok may be cited as a source, just as anything can be cited as a source, that doesn't mean that what was cited can be used as a fact. kobok is just a man (we think), and is subject to his fallacies. Not much of what he teaches has actually been proven as a fact. Carry this concept for all figures of authority and knowledge as well.

Logged

[23:48] <DanielH> You guys are all strange

[23:48] <DanielH> You have a different way of thinking (which is wrong)

How about a shave?

Steve

Posts By Osmosis

\*\*\*\*\*

Posts: 3289

Karma: 82

[View Profile](#)

Re: V's guide to debate (Or how to not sound like an idiot)

« Reply #5 on: July 01, 2007, 11:24:58 PM »

Good article.

~Steve

Logged

Mastery does not occur when you've performed a feat once or twice. Instead, it comes after years of training, when you realize that you no longer notice when you're performing a feat which used to require so much effort. Even walking takes years of training for a human: why not everything else?

Big Boss

Friggen Crazy

Posts By Osmosis

\*\*\*\*\*

Posts: 1458

Karma: 3

Owner of 100000 V-Points

[View Profile WWW](#)

Re: V's guide to debate (Or how to not sound like an idiot)

« Reply #6 on: July 02, 2007, 09:56:11 PM »

loved it. since as far back as i can remember, I've always been annoyed by people that can't accept that they might be wrong once in life. they'll argue for hours, knowing they are wrong, and keep arguing, cause of what? pride? reputation? all useless in the end. just be honest with yourself and others. fixes alot of things.

Logged

Join my Folding@Home team and do some good! #159490

Details at <http://folding.stanford.edu/>

Darkrain

Greenhorn

A Veritas Regular

\*\*

Posts: 56

Karma: 0

[View Profile WWW](#)

Re: V's guide to debate (Or how to not sound like an idiot)

« Reply #7 on: July 03, 2007, 09:19:44 AM »

Bravo..... gimme V tongue

Logged

THE HOMEWORK NEVER ENDS-It's a rolling dream, What I'd like to go after  
Even if tomorrow turns pale I shall get it and show you  
It's a rolling dream, What I'd like to go after  
If you stop it will get away, It's a matter of not losing heart

It's a rolling dream.....

Believe

TakeV

Mad Scientist

Veritas Council

Posts By Osmosis

\*\*\*\*\*

Posts: 943

Karma: 52

[View Profile](#)

Re: V's guide to debate (Or how to not sound like an idiot)

« Reply #8 on: July 23, 2007, 12:27:00 AM »

Hmmm, that is a problem. Not easy to access, is it?

Logged

Sigil for focus

Best argument ever.

Oriens Lvx Lucis

Posts By Osmosis

\*\*\*\*\*

Posts: 766

Karma: -1

[View Profile](#)

Re: V's guide to debate (Or how to not sound like an idiot)

« Reply #9 on: July 23, 2007, 04:34:07 AM »

Quote from: Saer

Bless your soul for this.

Aye...

This helps much. Perhaps the quality of debates on Veritas will change now.

Namaste

Logged

Frozen

Posting chief

Posts By Osmosis

\*\*\*\*\*

Posts: 1072

Karma: 0

Posting chief

[View Profile](#)

Re: V's guide to debate (Or how to not sound like an idiot)

« Reply #10 on: July 23, 2007, 09:39:08 PM »

Perhaps the best article to pass through here in a while.

I shall now proceed to change my name and move to Australia to avoid being slowly tortured to death by XIII and Gemini.

Logged

\* chirss was kicked by kobok (Denny Crane)

I CARVE EVERYTHING YOU SAY INTO MY LEFT ARM!

~ V

<ShoresofPluto> how often do u ignite fires with ur mind?

<kobok> On occasion.

[20:06] <kobok> XIII: You wear your girlfriend's pants??

[20:06] <XIII> kobok: On occasion.

Wonderland

Veritas Furniture

\*\*\*\*

Posts: 414

Karma: -1

ISIS

[View Profile WWW](#)

Re: V's guide to debate (Or how to not sound like an idiot)

« Reply #11 on: July 23, 2007, 09:57:42 PM »

Frozen, I said something like this to ThiefDeath once-upon-a-time: I (sometimes) totally hate it when you're right.

Good job, TakeV, and thanks for posting!

Logged

Yeeesh! Apparently I forgot the signature changes on all posts....AND until you change it again...oh well enough then...sorry 'bout that

Winds mover001

## A Familiar Feature

\*\*\*

Posts: 103

Karma: 0

[View Profile](#)

Re: V's guide to debate (Or how to not sound like an idiot)

« Reply #12 on: July 24, 2007, 05:58:21 PM »

Good point, excellent article.

Let's also not forget that people come to Veritas to learn. Learning and educating can be nerve wrecking, and everyone learns from each other. Let's hope everyone realizes their own educated experiences may come across to others in another way, than their learning experience did.

Logged

solstice

Dreamwalker

Posts By Osmosis

\*\*\*\*\*

Posts: 2114

Karma: -4

"Receive and transmit..."

[View Profile](#)

Re: V's guide to debate (Or how to not sound like an idiot)

« Reply #13 on: July 28, 2007, 05:43:15 PM »

Here's something else interesting to add; [http://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Ecological\\_fallacy](http://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Ecological_fallacy)

That seems to be a common error made by so-called skeptics, among other things.

You guys should probably learn to recognize these kinds of error, in the event that you are confronted about why you choose to live a metaphysical life.

Logged

Tell all the Truth but tell it slant: Success in Circuit lies. Too bright for our infirm

Delight. The Truth's superb surprise. As Lightning to the Children eased, with explanation kind. The Truth must dazzle gradually, or every man be blind.

Tefeari: The Giant Impact Hypothesis is a theory

Forg

The V' Smithy

Posts By Osmosis

\*\*\*\*\*

Posts: 827

Karma: 20

[View Profile](#)

Re: V's guide to debate (Or how to not sound like an idiot)

« Reply #14 on: July 31, 2007, 10:15:23 AM »

Bravo TakeV

Every point is valid and should be studied with great focus by everyone who is wrong

\*cough\*. Nice job Smiley

Logged

Be your own light, your own refuge. Believe only that which you test for yourself. Do not accept authority merely because it comes from a great man, or is written in a sacred book, for truth is different for each man and woman." -- Buddha

Pages: [1] 2 [Print](#)

« [previous](#) [next](#) »

[Jump to:](#)

=> [Main Hall](#)

Powered by MySQL Powered by PHP Powered by SMF 1.1.19 | SMF © 2013, Simple Machines

Oxygen design by Bloc Valid XHTML 1.0! Valid CSS!

<http://forums.vsociety.net/index.php/topic%2C10767.15.html>

2 captures

7 Jul 2010 - 26 May 2013

Jul MAY Jun

26

2010 2013 2014

About this capture

The Veritas Society

\*

[\\*Home](#)[Forums](#)[Chat](#)[Help](#)[Search](#)[Retro](#)[Login](#)[Register](#)

Welcome, Guest. Please login or register.

[Did you miss your activation email?](#)

May 26, 2013, 03:16:28 AM

Forever

Login with username, password and session length  
Search:

Advanced search

207897 Posts in 14770 Topics by 18477 Members - Latest Member: - PennyTyne  
Most online today: 66 - most online ever: 430 (June 28, 2007, 02:58:51 PM)

+ The Veritas Society

|-+ The Auditorium

| |-+ Main Hall

|| |-+ V's guide to debate (Or how to not sound like an idiot) 0 Members and 2 Guests  
are viewing this topic. « previous next »

Pages: 1 [2] Print

Author Topic: V's guide to debate (Or how to not sound like an idiot) (Read 3781  
times)

Rafnul!

he-who-posts-lots

Posts By Osmosis

\*\*\*\*\*

Posts: 1065

Karma: 25

View Profile

Re: V's guide to debate (Or how to not sound like an idiot)

« Reply #15 on: August 01, 2007, 02:24:43 PM »

Good Luck getting people to follow this one.

Logged

queen of the south

Posts By Osmosis

\*\*\*\*\*

Posts: 526

Karma: 1

WTF?????

View Profile WWW



Re: V's guide to debate (Or how to not sound like an idiot)

« Reply #16 on: August 13, 2007, 11:39:27 AM »

I Stand naked and ashamed-everything that could be said has been said,so Ill just add this:THANX for the not so gentle shove in the right direction grin

Logged

Changing your mind will change the world,World

peace,Love,Happiness,Health,Abundance-these things are obtainable right here,right now.

Pages: 1 [2] Print

« previous next »

Jump to:

=> Main Hall

Powered by MySQL Powered by PHP Powered by SMF 1.1.18 | SMF © 2013, Simple Machines

Oxygen design by Bloc Valid XHTML 1.0! Valid CSS!

<http://forums.v society.net/index.php?topic=6825.0>

4 captures

7 Jul 2010 - 17 Jul 2014

Sep JUL Aug

17

2011 2014 2015

About this capture

The Veritas Society

\*

\*HomeForumsChatHelpSearchRetroLoginRegister

Welcome, Guest. Please login or register.

Did you miss your activation email?

July 17, 2014, 01:53:53 AM

Forever

Login with username, password and session length

Search:

Advanced search

214926 Posts in 15321 Topics by 19763 Members - Latest Member: - ksyahu Most  
online today: 103 - most online ever: 430 (June 28, 2007, 02:58:51 PM)

+ The Veritas Society

| -+ The Auditorium

| | -+ Main Hall

|| -+ Eugenics 0 Members and 1 Guest are viewing this topic. « previous next »

Pages: [1] 2 3 ... 9 Print

Author Topic: Eugenics (Read 12172 times)

LightLink

Has a lot of posts

Veritas Furniture

\*\*\*\*

Posts: 470

Karma: 0

[View Profile](#)

Eugenics

« on: November 07, 2005, 06:33:30 PM »

Okay...I will try this thread again...hopefully my computer will not crash just as I finish, making me redo it again.

So, yesterday, among other things, Kobok and I touched upon the subject of Eugenics, its ethics and practicality.

I for one, think that Eugenics needs to be put into practice. Criminals for instance, obviously need to be fixed to prevent their tainted seed from remaining in the gene pool. Actually, criminals are the only ones that this needs to be put into practice with. Such things as murder and rape are inherently bad in of themselves, and are detrimental to society, giving nothing back. Thus, it is for the benefit of society to purge the genepool of such things.

So...thoughts?

Logged

ShiningDragon

Regular Member

A Familiar Feature

\*\*\*

Posts: 205

Karma: 0

Regular Member

[View Profile](#)

Re: Eugenics

« Reply #1 on: November 07, 2005, 07:40:46 PM »

Your assuming that behavior such as murder are genetic and not learned characteristics. I believe that most of who we are is from our genes, but we still pick up on behavior during our childhoods which lead to different types of criminals.

Logged

"The church says that the Earth is flat, but I know that it is round. For I have seen the shadow on the moon and I have more faith in the Shadow than in the Church." - Ferdinand Magellan

And you shall cry tears of crimson...

LightLink

Has a lot of posts

Veritas Furniture

\*\*\*\*

Posts: 470

Karma: 0

[View Profile](#)

Re: Eugenics

« Reply #2 on: November 07, 2005, 07:47:09 PM »

Quote

Your assuming that behavior such as murder are genetic and not learned characteristics. I believe that most of who we are is from our genes, but we still pick up on behavior during our childhoods which lead to different types of criminals.

You are assuming such things are learned behavior and not genetic.

Let us take the two scenerios and see which is better:

Such crime does have a genetic reason - The ellimination of a reason for such things. As well, it acts as a deterrent. In the case of males, a lower amount of testosterone will cause a decrease in anger, and sexual urge.

Such crime does not have a genetic reason - It still acts as a deterrent. It still causes a decrease of anger and so on.

One cannot be certain of a genetic reason, however it is certain that some people are

predisposed to be criminals. We know this, although it is...possible...that it is simple an enviromental factor, but I find it unlikely. Thus, the best option either way is to fix them.

Logged

Falcon

Vretsa Dcitoiray

Posts By Osmosis

\*\*\*\*\*

Posts: 702

Karma: 1

Veritas Mentor

[View Profile WWW](#)

Re: Eugenics

« Reply #3 on: November 07, 2005, 07:57:56 PM »

I used to agree with this but, I no longer do, After all, trying to wipe them out won't work because there already in there, it's how trhe person is brought up that effects the way they are.

Logged

Finding some things difficult and need a extra hand, Apply for a mentor that's what were here for <http://forums.vrsociety.net/index.php?topic=9706.0>

LightLink

Has a lot of posts

Veritas Furniture

\*\*\*\*\*

Posts: 470

Karma: 0

[View Profile](#)

Re: Eugenics

« Reply #4 on: November 07, 2005, 08:03:43 PM »

Hence the "fixing" in order to prevent any new ones coming about. I do not advocate killing them, after all, they would be so usefull as slaves to the state.

Let us not let this turn into a nature VS nurture debate.

Logged

Zake  
Veritas Staff  
Veritas Moderator  
Posts By Osmosis  
\*\*\*\*\*

Posts: 1722  
Karma: 1

Veritas Staff

[View Profile](#)

Re: Eugenics

« Reply #5 on: November 07, 2005, 08:07:03 PM »

First of all, there is a bit in the (American) constitution against "cruel and unusual punishment" (...stay on topic, people!).

I don't think nature vs nurture has to be debated as such; the following should seem pretty obvious. Criminals, even serious ones, are, by and large, normal people; they aren't strange inhuman monsters, as much as we'd like them to be. That environmental aspects play a large role in making criminals criminal is probably more or less beyond doubt- I'm sure more poor kids living in gang-controlled ghettos end up more likely to commit serious crimes than rich kids living in the suburbs. Similarly, its well accepted that most everyone has the capacity for serious crimes- I don't have references off-hand, but various trials and tests and simple experience have shown that the average Joe can be pretty nasty when faced with the right (or, more likely, wrong) circumstances. Attempting to link criminal tendencies to genes is much like trying to link an appreciation for nature to genes; it may have an effect, though environment counts for alot.

Eugenics may be applicable in certain cases, if one likes that general philosophy; there are genetic disorders which lead to mental conditions that can cause criminal behavior. These are exceptions to the rule, however, and even then, actual eugenics seems cruel and unnecessary; there are other answers.

The technology is being developed that would allow doctors to screen an unborn child of a parent with a genetic disorder for the disorder; instead of outright eugenics, it would likely as not be more ethically right to simply abort the child if the disorder was inherited. Same result, less cruel and unusual punishment.

Logged

Act; for the universe will never forget your movement, nor will it ever forgive your stillness.

Falcon  
Vretsa Dcitoinray  
Posts By Osmosis  
\*\*\*\*\*

Posts: 702  
Karma: 1

Veritas Mentor

View Profile WWW

Re: Eugenics

« Reply #6 on: November 07, 2005, 08:10:33 PM »

well people like that do act like animals yes, I'd say take away the children from then and give them a different way of life, away from violence and abuse etc

Logged

Finding some things difficult and need a extra hand, Apply for a mentor that's what were here for <http://forums.vociety.net/index.php?topic=9706.0>

Zankuro

Trasholin Can Fu Master

Veritas Furniture

\*\*\*\*\*

Posts: 394  
Karma: 0

"DD APPROVED! A-OKAYH"

View Profile

Re: Eugenics

« Reply #7 on: November 07, 2005, 08:15:49 PM »

...Brave New World much?

Plenty of supposesly "bad" people have reformed and "seen the light", so to speak.. going on to become productive and helpful people.

Turning it into a nature vs. nurture debate is unnessecary; that's essentially what it already is.

And testosterone doesn't mean anything unless the impulses it inspires are acted on.. these male and female hormonal stereotypes have always annoyed me. Unless an individual is truly insane or sufficiently retarded, they are technically free to act on any thought or impulse and are responsible for their actions, whatever their family history.

Logged

If your heart is large enough to envelop your adversaries, you can see right through them and avoid their attacks. And once you envelop them, you will be able to guide them along the path indicated to you by heaven and earth.

~Morihei Ueshiba

LightLink

Has a lot of posts

Veritas Furniture

\*\*\*\*

Posts: 470

Karma: 0

[View Profile](#)

Re: Eugenics

« Reply #8 on: November 07, 2005, 08:21:35 PM »

Quote

First of all, there is a bit in the (American) constitution against "cruel and unusual punishment" (...stay on topic, people!).

There is no universal idea of "cruel and unusual."

Quote

I don't think nature vs nurture has to be debated as such; the following should seem pretty obvious. Criminals, even serious ones, are, by and large, normal people; they aren't strange inhuman monsters, as much as we'd like them to be. That environmental aspects play a large role in making criminals criminal is probably more or less beyond doubt- I'm sure more poor kids living in gang-controlled ghettos end up more likely to commit serious crimes than rich kids living in the suburbs. Similarly, it's well accepted that most everyone has the capacity for serious crimes- I don't have references off-hand, but various trials and tests and simple experience have shown that the average Joe can be pretty nasty when faced with the right (or, more likely, wrong) circumstances. Attempting to link criminal tendencies to genes is much like trying to link an appreciation for nature to genes; it may have an effect, though environment counts for a lot.

Environmental reasons play a part, but it is very likely that genetics do too. For instance, one who is genetically predisposed to anger may end up committing murder much more easily than one who is not. Thus, it is best for society to get rid of such things. Anger does nothing in such large quantities for society.

We know that many murderers do in fact, have an enlarged gland in their brain (I do not know which one it is offhand) that does what I said, causes a predisposition towards anger. This is bad. It needs to be gotten rid of.

Quote

Eugenics may be applicable in certain cases, if one likes that general philosophy; there are genetic disorders which lead to mental conditions that can cause criminal behavior. These are exceptions to the rule, however, and even then, actual eugenics seems cruel and unnecessary; there are other answers.

Maybe to you. I find it very merciful.

Quote

The technology is being developed that would allow doctors to screen an unborn child of a parent with a genetic disorder for the disorder; instead of outright eugenics, it would likely as not be more ethically right to simply abort the child if the disorder was inherited. Same result, less cruel and unusual punishment.

Or...we can purge the genepool of such unwanted things in the first place, rather than aborting children. And this is in fact, outright eugenics, just like what I advocate. My way is better, as it does not do anything until somebody has actually done something, rather than just assuming that just because they have one gene, they will be evil. (one may have another gene that actually counters the original for instance)

Quote

well people like that do act like animals yes, I'd say take away the children from them and give them a different way of life, away from violence and abuse etc

Genetically this poses a problem. Assuming I am right, and such things have heavy genetic factors, their already present children will end up with the genes as well...does one fix them too? I see it as kinda cruel, but there are some benefits, such as more adequately purging the gene pool, and an even larger deterrent to those who would murder or rape. But punishing those who have done nothing...is iffy.

At any rate, this assumes I am right. If I am right, your supposed idea will do nothing. Well...it may do \*something\* but there is no guarantee that it will actually prevent such things.

Quote

...Brave New World much?



Nope.

Quote

Plenty of supposedly "bad" people have reformed and "seen the light", so to speak.. going on to become productive and helpful people.

And many many more have not. Why take the chance?

Quote

Turning it into a nature vs. nurture debate is unnecessary; that's essentially what it already is.

No, it is a eugenics debate. Good job.

Quote

And testosterone doesn't mean anything unless the impulses it inspires are acted on..

Um hello? Such a large amount of testosterone will increase the chances that these impulses will be acted on, as they are stronger.

Quote

these male and female hormonal stereotypes have always annoyed me.

I am sorry, but facts are facts. Testosterone does do this. We know it, and pretending that it is a "stereotype" is just some strange way of hiding.

Quote

Unless an individual is truly insane or sufficiently retarded, they are technically free to act on any thought or impulse and are responsible for their actions, whatever their family history

Huh? What are you trying to say here?

Logged  
SleepWalker  
Pool Boy  
Posts By Osmosis  
\*\*\*\*\*

Posts: 588

Karma: 2

Pinkus Elefantus

[View Profile](#)

Re: Eugenics

« Reply #9 on: November 07, 2005, 08:21:42 PM »

Oh this sounds a whole lot like a surgery where they take something out and pretend like it made a difference, yet the patient still dies.

Logged

How can you explain freedom, never having experienced it.

From the moment we are born we conform to the physical world. In narrow awareness of all that there is to perceive.

Try Tachyon[URL

Zankuro

Trasholin Can Fu Master

Veritas Furniture

\*\*\*\*

Posts: 394

Karma: 0

"DD APPROVED! A-OKAYH"

[View Profile](#)

Re: Eugenics

« Reply #10 on: November 07, 2005, 08:34:46 PM »

Actually, the issue is quite reminiscent of BNW. I'll go ahead and state that ostentatiously instead of using a mildly sarcastic rhetorical question. The literal denotation of eugenics is "The study of hereditary improvement of the human race by controlled selective breeding.", which is essentially the premise of the whole book.

In any case.. free will. Feeling does not equate to action. The fact that most people apparently can't overcome hormonal impulses (thus creating said stereotypes in the first place) doesn't mean that any given person is a slave to testosterone.

And as to the not-entirely-polite "No, it is a eugenics debate. Good job." in response to my "Turning it into a nature vs. nurture debate is unnecessary; that's essentially what it already is.", I fail to see the difference if the issue is elimination/change of certain characteristics/people due to genetic profiling, when the opposing side is arguing that genes are not so important in behavior as environment.

Logged

If your heart is large enough to envelop your adversaries, you can see right through them and avoid their attacks. And once you envelop them, you will be able to guide

them along the path indicated to you by heaven and earth.

~Morihei Ueshiba

Zake

Veritas Staff

Veritas Moderator

Posts By Osmosis

\*\*\*\*\*

Posts: 1722

Karma: 1

Veritas Staff

[View Profile](#)

Re: Eugenics

« Reply #11 on: November 07, 2005, 08:35:56 PM »

I was starting to think the same bit, Zank.

Go look up "eugenics" in a dictionary, sleepwalker -\_- . Has anyone ever died from such an operation? (Modern era- no talking about ancient chinese eunuchs or whatever).

Quote from: LightLink on November 07, 2005, 08:21:35 PM

Quote

Eugenics may be applicable in certain cases, if one likes that general philosophy; there are genetic disorders which lead to mental conditions that can cause criminal behavior. These are exceptions to the rule, however, and even then, actual eugenics seems cruel and unnecessary; there are other answers.

Maybe to you. I find it very mercifull.

I assume that, in addition to eugenics, the standard society-saving punishments would be in effect (jail, etc), so eugenics is still less merciful (who would want to lose their ability to have children?) than, say, my suggestion.

Quote from: LightLink on November 07, 2005, 08:21:35 PM

Quote

The technology is being developed that would allow doctors to screen an unborn child of a parent with a genetic disorder for the disorder; instead of outright eugenics, it would likely as not be more ethically right to simply abort the child if the disorder was inherited. Same result, less cruel and unusual punishment.

Or...we can purge the genepool of such unwanted things in the first place, rather than aborting children. And this is in fact, outright eugenics, just like what I advocate. My way is better, as it does not do anything until somebody has actually done something, rather than just assuming that just because they have one gene, they will be evil. (one may have another gene that actually counters the original for instance)

It is not outright eugenics; that the "criminal disorder" would be passed down to the child is not certain, so the subject would be able to have (non-criminal-tendency) children. I also would not advocate it as a procedure on everyone; only when the disorder has been shown to cause problems, such as (in this instance) in the case as when the parent is an actual criminal.

« Last Edit: November 07, 2005, 08:42:50 PM by Zake »      Logged

Act; for the universe will never forget your movement, nor will it ever forgive your stillness.

ThiefDeath

Posting chief

Posts By Osmosis

\*\*\*\*\*

Posts: 1544

Karma: 4

Grammaton Cleric

[View Profile](#)

Re: Eugenics

« Reply #12 on: November 07, 2005, 08:43:17 PM »

Criminals can be very productive people when put in a labor prison. I'd say the people who should be eliminated are those with hereditary diseases and disabilities.

As for criminality being genetic, I'd say criminals who do it for thrill and passion either have it genetically or have it from a disorder, and criminals who do it out of desperation, fear, or need do it because of the situation they are in and it is not genetic.

Logged

[23:48] <DanielH> You guys are all strange

[23:48] <DanielH> You have a different way of thinking (which is wrong)

How about a shave?

LightLink

Has a lot of posts

Veritas Furniture

\*\*\*\*

Posts: 470  
Karma: 0

[View Profile](#)

Re: Eugenics

« Reply #13 on: November 07, 2005, 08:50:17 PM »

Quote

I assume that, in addition to eugenics, the standard society-saving punishments would be in effect (jail, etc), so eugenics is still less merciful (who would want to lose their ability to have children?) than, say, my suggestion.

Actually, I would prefer outright slavery to the state. Being in jail just means you get free room and board for a long long time. You should work for that, thus, if you commit a horrible crime, you void your rights. You will work for what the state wishes you to work for, and all your property will be taken and given away...most likely to your victims. Or it may simply be retaken.

At any rate, sure, Jail is used. But jail...pfft. That is dumb, like I said. We need people to fear doing crime. Now, no amount of fear will get rid of it, but it will help.

Quote

It is not outright eugenics; that the "criminal disorder" would be passed down to the child is not certain, so the subject would be able to have (non-criminal-tendency) children. I also would not advocate it as a procedure on everyone; only when the disorder has been shown to cause problems, such as (in this instance) in the case as when the parent is an actual criminal.

Um, it is outright eugenics. It is not allowing those with genes deemed unfavorable to reproduce, your method simply accomplishes this by not allowing them to be born at all.

Quote

In any case.. free will. Feeling does not equate to action. The fact that most people apparently can't overcome hormonal impulses (thus creating said stereotypes in the first place) doesn't mean that any given person is a slave to testosterone.

I never said they were. In fact, this is why I say we should not punish anybody until they actually do something. To factor in other factors.

Quote

I fail to see the difference if the issue is elimination/change of certain characteristics/people due to genetic profiling, when the opposing side is arguing that

genes are not so important in behavior as environment.

It is quite sad that there are still people out there that believe that tabula rosa crap. I am sorry, but most things really are genetic. Sure, environment plays a role, but genetics are what ultimately determine everything we do. Get over it.

Example:

I have the "murder gene" but am treated wonderfully. Though some miracle, I do not kill. Wonderful. Now, I have children who inherit it, and they are not treated so well. Thus they kill. They are castrated. Great. This assumes you are right, and environment plays almost all the role.

Now, it is silly to think that genetics plays no factor at all. So, assuming even that the environment is the major factor, it is still beneficial to get rid of the gene.

Quote

Criminals can be very productive people when put in a labor prison. I'd say the people who should be eliminated are those with hereditary diseases and disabilities.

Me too. And I advocate "slave the state" as well.

Quote

As for criminality being genetic, I'd say criminals who do it for thrill and passion either have it genetically or have it from a disorder, and criminals who do it out of desperation, fear, or need do it because of the situation they are in and it is not genetic.

Why bother trying to differentiate? I say cut them all!

Now in all seriousness, either way, it is best to fix them. If they do it out of fear, desperation, and because the situation "demanded" it, it is still most likely a genetic problem, causes them to be unable to think enough to get out of the situation through legal means. Snip snip.

Logged  
Zake  
Veritas Staff  
Veritas Moderator  
Posts By Osmosis

\*\*\*\*\*

Posts: 1722  
Karma: 1

Veritas Staff

[View Profile](#)

Re: Eugenics

« Reply #14 on: November 07, 2005, 09:07:12 PM »

Quote from: LightLink on November 07, 2005, 08:50:17 PM

Quote

I assume that, in addition to eugenics, the standard society-saving punishments would be in effect (jail, etc), so eugenics is still less merciful (who would want to lose their ability to have children?) than, say, my suggestion.

Actually, I would prefer outright slavery to the state. Being in jail just means you get free room and board for a long long time. You should work for that, thus, if you commit a horrible crime, you void your rights. You will work for what the state wishes you to work for, and all your property will be taken and given away...most likely to your victims. Or it may simply be retaken.

At any rate, sure, Jail is used. But jail...pfft. That is dumb, like I said. We need people to fear doing crime. Now, no amount of fear will get rid of it, but it will help.

...Heh, by this view, why not use the death penalty? After all, places that use it have far lower crime rates because the fear of being punished is the foremost thing on anyones mind as they commit a crime.

The above paragraph is entirely sarcastic- last I heard, the death penalty (and, by logical extension, other fearsome punishments) have crime rates around the same as states that use regular ol' life in prison.

Quote from: LightLink on November 07, 2005, 08:50:17 PM

Quote

It is not outright eugenics; that the "criminal disorder" would be passed down to the child is not certain, so the subject would be able to have (non-criminal-tendency) children. I also would not advocate it as a procedure on everyone; only when the disorder has been shown to cause problems, such as (in this instance) in the case as when the parent is an an actual criminal.

Um, it is outright eugenics. It is not allowing those with genes deemed unfavorable to reproduce, your method simply accomplishes this by not allowing them to be born at all.

You misunderstand the process I'm talking about. It goes like this; when a criminal and his wife really love each other, and the birds and the bees and so forth, the pregnant criminal or wife-of-criminal goes/is taken over to a clinic. There, genetic tests are run

on the fetus, which look for the gene responsible for the (in this case) criminal disorder. If the gene is present, the fetus is aborted; if not, its allowed to be born. Keep in mind, that a criminal disorder in a parent would not necessarily be passed down; this is simple Mendelian genetics.

Simple case in point; genetic criminals would be able to have children, therefore its not eugenics, basically by definition.

Quote from: LightLink on November 07, 2005, 08:50:17 PM

Quote

In any case.. free will. Feeling does not equate to action. The fact that most people apparently can't overcome hormonal impulses (thus creating said stereotypes in the first place) doesn't mean that any given person is a slave to testosterone.

I never said they were. In fact, this is why I say we should not punish anybody untill they actually do something. To factor in other factors.

The point is, though, that their potential children haven't done anything. Why deny them existence when they may very well not follow their "genetic destiny"?

Perhaps this is another instance where another, nicer system can be used than eugenics. Why not just focus on giving genetically "criminal" children a benign environment that allows them to develop into law-abiding people? If you accept the huge role that nurture plays in the development of "criminal nature," it has to be admitted that this would be a largely effective procedure (except for the true disorders, perhaps... thus the other process, discussed above.)

Logged

Act; for the universe will never forget your movement, nor will it ever forgive your stillness.

Pages: [1] 2 3 ... 9 Print

« previous next »

Jump to:

=> Main Hall

Powered by MySQL Powered by PHP Powered by SMF 1.1.19 | SMF © 2013, Simple Machines

Oxygen design by Bloc Valid XHTML 1.0! Valid CSS!

<http://forums.vsociety.net/index.php/topic%2C6825.15.html>

1 capture

7 Jul 2010

Jun JUL Aug

07

2009 2010 2011

About this capture



The Veritas Society

\*

\*HomeForumsChatHelpSearchLoginRegister

Welcome, Guest. Please login or register.

Did you miss your activation email?

July 07, 2010, 11:42:00 AM

Forever

Login with username, password and session length

Search:

Advanced search

166541 Posts in 12245 Topics by 6539 Members - Latest Member: - VeritaSeraph

Most online today: 67 - most online ever: 430 (June 28, 2007, 02:58:51 PM)

+ The Veritas Society

|-+ The Auditorium

||-+ Main Hall

|||-+ Eugenics 0 Members and 1 Guest are viewing this topic. « previous next »

Pages: 1 [2] 3 4 ... 9Print

Author Topic: Eugenics (Read 6543 times)

kobok

Veritas Council

Tech Team

Posts By Osmosis

\*\*\*\*\*

Posts: 3885

Veritas Council

View Profile

Re: Eugenics

« Reply #15 on: November 07, 2005, 10:51:06 PM »

Quote from: LightLink on November 07, 2005, 06:33:30 PM

So, yesterday, among other things, Kobok and I touched upon the subject of Eugenics, its ethics and practicality.

Since my name has been invoked, let me just clarify that I think eugenics is a moronic idea. It's an idea based on several logical fallacies, and requires one to believe, firstly, that legality is a judge of character quality, and secondly, that behavior is a judge of

genetic quality. Both of these are false, and at best, there are small correlations with major and frequent exceptions to the correlation.

For a few examples, lets consider some criminals. Mahatma Gandhi was a criminal. Martin Luther King Jr. was a criminal. Socrates was a criminal. Jesus was a criminal. Nelson Mandela was a criminal. Your proposal says that these people are not genetically fit. And I know, you'll try to compensate by choosing some smaller set of crimes to exclude these people, but in so doing you would only be reformulating the same intrinsic problem, which is that criminal conviction cannot accurately assess genetic value.

Logged  
LightLink  
Has a lot of posts  
Veritas Furniture  
\*\*\*\*

Posts: 470

Haruka Pwns You

[View Profile](#)

Re: Eugenics

« Reply #16 on: November 08, 2005, 05:06:44 AM »

Quote

For a few examples, lets consider some criminals. Mahatma Gandhi was a criminal. Martin Luther King Jr. was a criminal. Socrates was a criminal. Jesus was a criminal. Nelson Mandela was a criminal. Your proposal says that these people are not genetically fit. And I know, you'll try to compensate by choosing some smaller set of crimes to exclude these people, but in so doing you would only be reformulating the same intrinsic problem, which is that criminal conviction cannot accurately assess genetic value.

Yes, you brought these people up before. I said that their crimes were meaningless, since if people do not notice, I specifcy to only murder and rape. And have not mentioned it yet, but abuse and major theft. "Civil dissobedience" although stupid and annoying, is not a horrible horrible thing.

Quote

...Heh, by this view, why not use the death penalty? After all, places that use it have far lower crime rates because the fear of being punished is the foremost thing on anyones mind as they commit a crime.

The above paragraph is entirely sarcastic- last I heard, the death penalty (and, by logical extension, other fearsome punishments) have crime rates around the same as

states that use regular ol' life in prison.

Actually, no. The death penalty does in fact act as a deterrent, however it is not very large. Most likely because death...well, that is not the worst that can happen.

Quote

You misunderstand the process I'm talking about. It goes like this; when a criminal and his wife really love each other, and the birds and the bees and so forth, the pregnant criminal or wife-of-criminal goes/is taken over to a clinic. There, genetic tests are run on the fetus, which look for the gene responsible for the (in this case) criminal disorder. If the gene is present, the fetus is aborted; if not, its allowed to be born. Keep in mind, that a criminal disorder in a parent would not necessarily be passed down; this is simple Mendelian genetics.

I understand you perfectly. I knew this is what you ment, and what I say still applies. It is outright eugenics by not allowing the babies with faulty genes to even be born, and thus getting rid of the unwanted gene over time.

Quote

Simple case in point; genetic criminals would be able to have children, therefore its not eugenics, basically by definition.

Yes, it is eugenics, as the criminals gene will not be able to pass on through tampering. The unwanted gene is gotten rid of.

Quote

The point is, though, that their potential children haven't done anything. Why deny them existence when they may very well not follow their "genetic destiny"?

What are you talking about? I do not advocate such things, I already said twice.

Quote

Perhaps this is another instance where another, nicer system can be used than eugenics. Why not just focus on giving genetically "criminal" children a benign environment that allows them to develop into law-abiding people? If you accept the huge role that nurture plays in the development of "criminal nature," it has to be admitted that this would be a largely effective procedure (except for the true disorders, perhaps... thus the other process, discussed above.)

Because attempting to nurter those who might become criminals is wastefull, and treats them unjustly for them having done nothing. It is better to simply wait and see if they do anything at all, before attempting to fix the problem.

Logged

Faijer

In Veritas, Faijer Moderates You

Veritas Moderator

Posts By Osmosis

\*\*\*\*\*

Posts: 2909

Existential Pragmatist

View Profile WWW

Re: Eugenics

« Reply #17 on: November 08, 2005, 05:48:03 AM »

Nature vs. nurture did I hear?

<http://news.bbc.co.uk/2/hi/health/4293520.stm> - Google "white vs grey matter and lying" for more links

It seems that physiological components of the brain, white and grey matter, can actually affect our morality and ability to therefore commit acts of "crime" (though as kobok pointed out, what is crime? Merely the deviation and destruction of established social rules and laws?). However I would not say the amount is fixed, and would probably change the most during early childhood and teens, but that said, if the cause is physical like this research suggests, then it would certainly be manipulatable by medicine.

Logged

Click here for my blog: All Faijer, all the time.

The Game

SleepWalker

Pool Boy

Posts By Osmosis

\*\*\*\*\*

Posts: 588

Pinkus Elefantus

View Profile

Re: Eugenics

« Reply #18 on: November 08, 2005, 06:13:58 AM »

Ofcourse behaviour can be manipulated by medicine all sorts of drugs, say sodium barbiturate a whole bunch of hypnotherapy.

Eugenics is a far worse Idea, here we have criminals, most likely self hating seeking significance through destruction.

Eugenics then gives them further reason to feel insignificant, what is there reaction?

Apart from every single claim you make LL being completely off, it simply will not fly. Such a thing would not do well with religious groups, pro-choice cops heat. This is destruction of a massive scale on possible descendants, forced interference such as this does not sit well. There is no freaking criminal gene there is no bright blinking highlighted gene that specifically instills criminal tendencies solely. Survival instincts fearful delusion the situation and drastic action cannot be attributed to genetics of a single person in their lone lifetime. Yourself in the same condition under the same circumstances would do as they did. This is not about justice, this holds no virtue it's fearful vindictiveness. Perhaps if this were to be offered as a plea bargain to sexual offenders, the decision is in their own hands.

Logged

How can you explain freedom, never having experienced it. From the moment we are born we conform to the physical world. In narrow awareness of all that there is to perceive.

Try Tachyon[URL

ThiefDeath

Posting chief

Posts By Osmosis

\*\*\*\*\*

Posts: 1499

Grammaton Cleric

View Profile

Re: Eugenics

« Reply #19 on: November 08, 2005, 08:55:09 AM »

Quote from: SleepWalker on November 08, 2005, 06:13:58 AM

Such a thing would not do well with religious groups, pro-choice cops heat.

Don't forget about the mafia, who run more of the country than you'd like to know.

Logged

[23:48] <DanielH> You guys are all strange

[23:48] <DanielH> You have a different way of thinking (which is wrong)

How about a shave?

kakkarot

0. The Fool... Inverted?

Posts By Osmosis

\*\*\*\*\*

Posts: 2701

Pirate "Not-A-Mod" BoB

[View Profile](#)

Re: Eugenics

« Reply #20 on: November 08, 2005, 10:26:42 AM »

HOW IN HELL could criminal behaviour be genetic? "Criminal behaviour" is a subjective term referring to people who break the man-made laws of any given society (is a person "a criminal in need of eugenic modification" if they break the laws of a human country they don't even reside in?!). HOW does such disobedience to man-made laws stem from nature's blueprints?

~kakkarot

Edit: Oh, I guess I should have read everyone else's responses before adding my rehashed version ^\_^ But as for murder and rape being accounted as "wrong" even by Nature: if that is true then why do animals do them and go unpunished? The idea of "criminal" stems from societal values and judging; Nature places neither good karma nor bad karma on any actions, regardless of how praiseworthy or despicable we humans may deem them.

Murder and rape are in the genes? I call bullshit as that would make it completely impossible for some people to commit either, while making it completely impossible for some people to not commit them.

« Last Edit: November 08, 2005, 10:33:15 AM by kakkarot »    Logged

Philippians 2:5 Your attitude should be the same as that of Christ Jesus: 6 Who, being in very nature God, did not consider equality with God something to be grasped, 7 but made himself nothing, taking the very nature of a servant, being made in human likeness.

kobok

Veritas Council

Tech Team

Posts By Osmosis

\*\*\*\*\*

Posts: 3885

Veritas Council

[View Profile](#)

Re: Eugenics

« Reply #21 on: November 08, 2005, 10:51:19 AM »

Quote from: LightLink on November 08, 2005, 05:06:44 AM

Yes, you brought these people up before. I said that their crimes were meaningless, since if people do not notice, I specify to only murder and rape. And have not mentioned it yet, but abuse and major theft. "Civil disobedience" although stupid and annoying, is not a horrible horrible thing.

George Washington killed people. Are his genes unfit? How about someone who shoots someone who broke into his house at night? How about someone who shoots someone who broke into his house at night because the guy was trying to find food to eat, but the guy who shot him had no idea why he broke into the house? How about someone who shoots someone for running up to him in a crazed manner holding what appears to be a weapon, but then it later turns out it wasn't a weapon? How about someone who kills a man for raping and killing his sister?

Which of these indicate problem genes which must be eliminated? The answer is that none of them are indicators, because behavior is not so simply determined by the genetics of an individual.

Logged  
LightLink  
Has a lot of posts  
Veritas Furniture

\*\*\*\*

Posts: 470

Haruka Pwns You

[View Profile](#)

Re: Eugenics

« Reply #22 on: November 08, 2005, 03:32:00 PM »

Silly hypothetical questions.

Quote

George Washington killed people. Are his genes unfit?

The situation in which he killed people was not a bad one.

Quote

How about someone who shoots someone who broke into his house at night?

Self defence is ethical, and not a crime.

Quote

How about someone who shoots someone who broke into his house at night because the guy was trying to find food to eat, but the guy who shot him had no idea why he broke into the house?

Self defence once again. It matters not the situation in which drives one to crime. There are plenty of legal ways to get food. Attempting an illegal route nearly means you are incapable of thinking enough to go through a legal one. At any rate, the killing is justified, and it matters not why the other guy did it, nearly that he did it.

Quote

How about someone who shoots someone for running up to him in a crazed manner holding what appears to be a weapon, but then it later turns out it wasn't a weapon?

Self defence. Oops then. What kind of idiot goes around running up to some guy in a crazed manner holding a conspicuous object?

Quote

How about someone who kills a man for raping and killing his sister?

Justice has been done by the castration of the criminal. The killing is not justified, and he is therefore a criminal and killer, and needs to be fixed.

Quote

Which of these indicate problem genes which must be eliminated? The answer is that none of them are indicators, because behavior is not so simply determined by the genetics of an individual.

And I say, while this is true to a point, it matters not. Genes contribute, and it is best to play it safe and eliminate them where they are found.

Quote

HOW IN HELL could criminal behaviour be genetic? "Criminal behaviour" is a subjective term referring to people who break the man-made laws of any given society (is a person "a criminal in need of eugenic modification" if they break the laws of a human country they don't even reside in?!).

Please do not try to sound all philosophical, trying to point out the subjectivity of laws. They do not exist, the law is the law. Law is not subjective, ethics are, and while ethics are what laws are based on, it matters not. Laws are laws, so please do not try to act smart.



Quote

HOW does such disobedience to man-made laws stem from nature's blueprints?

You are dumb. Go away. It is impossible that you know anything of what I am saying, or else you would not ask such inane questions. Murder is a universal crime. Theft is a universal crime. Rape is aswell. There are of course, justifiable reasons for these 3, and that is mostly universal aswell (war) and as such it matters not at that time. The point is, is that every crime I bring up are pretty much, universal. That would be because they are inherently bad to society, so every society has outlawed them.

Quote

Edit: Oh, I guess I should have read everyone else's responses before adding my rehashed version ^\_^ But as for murder and rape being accounted as "wrong" even by Nature: if that is true then why do animals do them and go unpunished?

God, please go away. Nobody said murder and rape was wrong by Nature...as if nature was some sort of model for ethics or something. Sheesh, I said rape and murder were inherently detrimental to human society. Big difference.

Quote

The idea of "criminal" stems from societal values and judging; Nature places neither good karma nor bad karma on any actions, regardless of how praiseworthy or despicable we humans may deem them.

Nobody cares about the subjectivity of ethics. Stay on topic. Nobody cares about nature either. Stay on topic. Karma matters not aswell. Stay on topic!

By your crazy logic, nothing is unethical. I can do whatever, and nothing is illegal. Great logic buddy.

Quote

Murder and rape are in the genes? I call bullshit as that would make it completely impossible for some people to commit either, while making it completely impossible for some people to not commit them.

Please please please read what I say before you type. You sound so stupid when you get things so horribly wrong. I said genes are a factor. A factor! That means it is not the only reason, merely one in a large number of reasons.

Quote

Ofcourse behaviour can be manipulated by medicine all sorts of drugs, say sodium barbiturate a whole bunch of hypnotherapy.

Sure can.

Quote

Eugenics is a far worse Idea, here we have criminals, most likely self hating seeking significance through destruction. Eugenics then gives them further reason to feel insignificant, what is there reaction?

Nobody cares. They are inferior for committing such crimes. It matters not what they think or feel. They give up their rights by doing such things.

Quote

Apart from every single claim you make LL being completely off, it simply will not fly.

Nice job providing logic saying why. How is everything I say wrong?

Quote

Such a thing would not do well with religious groups, pro-choice cops heat.

Abortion, homosexuals, drugs, evolution, and the idea of an old earth do not sit well with religious groups. Does that mean anything? No.

Quote

This is destruction of a massive scale on possible descendants, forced interference such as this does not sit well

Haha. So is war. Do we care? No. And how do you know it would not sit well. I do not see any polls regarding the general populace of such ideas.

Quote

There is no freaking criminal gene there is no bright blinking highlighted gene that specifically instills criminal tendencies solely.

1 - how do you know genetics does not play a factor. (which you imply)

2 - Nobody said it was bright and blinking, and instills criminal behavior solely. Merely that ones with certain genes may be more likely to commit crimes, and that is plenty of justification to eradicate them.

Quote

Survival instincts fearful delusion the situation and drastic action cannot be attributed to genetics of a single person in their lone lifetime.

This sentence does not make sense. Fix it.

Quote

Yourselves in the same condition under the same circumstances would do as they did.

You do not know this. Do not speak as if you know what I would not or would do. Especially when you do not even give a situation.

Quote

This is not about justice, this holds no virtue it's fearful vindictiveness.

Is English your first language? I cannot understand much of what you say.

And this is not about justice (the only half of that sentence I got) it is about the right for society to protect itself. To purge bad genes from the gene pool. Justice just happens to come with it in my case.

Quote

Perhaps if this were to be offered as a plea bargain to sexual offenders, the decision is in their own hands.

Pfft. Please. They get no choice in anything if they are broken enough to do such things.

On a final note, yes I am being rude to a few people. I acknowledge this, but when they are shown to be inconsiderate enough to not actually read what I say, and then go off and whine about what I did not say, saying I am wrong for saying something I never said, I get irked. Therefore, my rudeness is justified as they were rude to me for not reading what I said.

« Last Edit: November 08, 2005, 03:35:28 PM by LightLink » Logged

Zake

Veritas Staff

Veritas Moderator

Posts By Osmosis

\*\*\*\*\*

Posts: 1722

Veritas Staff

[View Profile](#)

Re: Eugenics

« Reply #23 on: November 08, 2005, 04:13:45 PM »

Perhaps it would be easier for us to correctly understand your arguments, LL, if you didn't put them in the form of single sentences in response to other people's single sentences; it is an entirely valid, indeed, more effective, method of debate to respond to the overall point of, say, a paragraph, rather than refuting every individual clause by itself.

On that note, on your general point that murder, theft, rape, etc are "universal crimes";

murder is universally a crime, it can be argued, but the definition of "murder" is far from universal. There are circumstances in which it would be acceptable to kill a person (self defense, war, etc), and this is not "murder," or legally punished as such. In some such cases, it is easy to imagine, a person could well have acted with "criminal intent," or at the compulsion of "criminal genes." Inversely, it is easy to imagine cases where a person acted without "criminal intent," without "criminal genes," and such a killing would still be qualified as "murder."

My understanding of kobok's basic point is that, even for a crime so fundamental as killing someone, the accountability, the wrongness of the crime, is always subjective. Kobok says that George Washington was a killer, and you argue that his case was a justifiable one- but what if he were being tried by Revolutionary-war era Britain? They would have a different view. Indeed, had they the scientific knowledge, they would perhaps have considered the genes that influenced him to be a "rebel" (to, of course, the extent he was influenced by his genes in this regard) to be "criminal." Whereas Good Ol' American Values considers a drive to overturn distasteful and harmful aspects of society to be a good thing.

Logged

Act; for the universe will never forget your movement, nor will it ever forgive your stillness.

kobok

Veritas Council

Tech Team

Posts By Osmosis

\*\*\*\*\*

Posts: 3885

Veritas Council

[View Profile](#)

Re: Eugenics

« Reply #24 on: November 08, 2005, 04:16:02 PM »

Quote from: LightLink on November 08, 2005, 03:32:00 PM

Quote

George Washington killed people. Are his genes unfit?

The situation in which he killed people was not a bad one.

According to whose judgment? The method of deciding is critical, because for an approach as drastic as you're proposing, it must be rigorously foolproof.

Quote from: LightLink on November 08, 2005, 03:32:00 PM

Quote

How about someone who shoots someone for running up to him in a crazed manner holding what appears to be a weapon, but then it later turns out it wasn't a weapon?

Self defence. Oops then. What kind of idiot goes around running up to some guy in a crazed manner holding a conspicuouse object?

This event DID happen recently. It turns out, it was a foreign exchange student who was invited to a party, and ran up to the house carrying his camera and saying, "Is this where the party is?" He was shot and killed by a trigger-happy and slightly paranoid man. If you'll note, you only concluded that he was an idiot because of the way I presented the scenario the first time, and therein lies one of the major problems. Presentation of the situation can change the answer.

Quote from: LightLink on November 08, 2005, 03:32:00 PM

Quote

How about someone who kills a man for raping and killing his sister?

Justice has been done by the castration of the criminal. The killing is not justified, and he is therefore a criminal and killer, and needs to be fixed.

How about a man who castrates a second man for raping and killing his sister?  
Because this man is you.

Quote from: LightLink on November 08, 2005, 03:32:00 PM

Quote

Which of these indicate problem genes which must be eliminated? The answer is that none of them are indicators, because behavior is not so simply determined by the genetics of an individual.

And I say, while this is true to a point, it matters not. Genes contribute, and it is best to play it safe and elliminate them where they are found.

How is it "playing it safe" to assume something is a problem and eliminate it without proving that it's a problem? This violates the basic premise of innocence until proven guilty.

Quote from: LightLink on November 08, 2005, 03:32:00 PM

You are dumb. Go away. It is impossible that you know anything of what I am saying, or else you would not ask such inane questions. ...

...

God, please go away ...

...

You sound so stupid ...

...

On a final note, yes I am being rude to a few people. I aknowledge this, but when they are shown to be inconsiderate enough to not actually read what I say, and then go off

and whine about what I did not say, saying I am wrong for saying something I never said, I get irked. Therefore, my rudeness is justified as they were rude to me for not reading what I said.

You may feel your rudeness is "justified", but it is not permitted, and in blatant violation of the rules. You WILL be respectful here, in this discussion and elsewhere, or you will be removed.

Logged  
LightLink  
Has a lot of posts  
Veritas Furniture  
\*\*\*\*

Posts: 470

Haruka Pwns You

[View Profile](#)

Re: Eugenics  
« Reply #25 on: November 08, 2005, 04:53:17 PM »

Quote

According to whose judgment? The method of deciding is critical, because for an approach as drastic as you're proposing, it must be rigorously foolproof.

War is war. A hot war requires killing. It is not unethical to kill during war.

Quote

This event DID happen recently. It turns out, it was a foreign exchange student who was invited to a party, and ran up to the house carrying his camera and saying, "Is this where the party is?" He was shot and killed by a trigger-happy and slightly paranoid man. If you'll note, you only concluded that he was an idiot because of the way I presented the scenario the first time, and therein lies one of the major problems. Presentation of the situation can change the answer.

Surely it can...if only everything was recorded we could make more accurate judgments...

Quote

How about a man who castrates a second man for raping and killing his sister?  
Because this man is you.

I do not understand.

Quote

How is it "playing it safe" to assume something is a problem and eliminate it without

proving that it's a problem? This violates the basic premise of innocence until proven guilty.

Because it is very likely that this "something" as you call it, is a problem. It is not proven without a doubt yet, but still very likely. Why risk the chance. When one can actually help get rid of a cause of such behavior.

Quote

You may feel your rudeness is "justified", but it is not permitted, and in blatant violation of the rules. You WILL be respectful here, in this discussion and elsewhere, or you will be removed.

Then why do people not read what I say? People need to be respectful to me and read what I say, rather than jump to baseless conclusions. It is a slap in the face to have people do such crazy things.

Quote

Perhaps it would be easier for us to correctly understand your arguments, LL, if you didn't put them in the form of single sentences in response to other people's single sentences; it is an entirely valid, indeed, more effective, method of debate to respond to the overall point of, say, a paragraph, rather than refuting every individual clause by itself.

I do not believe so. You see, if I were to take it as a paragraph, a paragraph that has more than one point mind you, then it becomes confusing as to which point I am in fact referring to. Confusion is eliminated by taking it an idea at a time.

Quote

On that note, on your general point that murder, theft, rape, etc are "universal crimes"; murder is universally a crime, it can be argued, but the definition of "murder" is far from universal. There are circumstances in which it would be acceptable to kill a person (self defense, war, etc), and this is not "murder," or legally punished as such. In some such cases, it is easy to imagine, a person could well have acted with "criminal intent," or at the compulsion of "criminal genes." Inversely, it is easy to imagine cases where a person acted without "criminal intent," without "criminal genes," and such a killing would still be qualified as "murder."

Yes, this is true. And I have addressed such cases already. Self defence and war have been brought up. Others have been as well. Read please.

Quote

My understanding of Kobok's basic point is that, even for a crime so fundamental as killing someone, the accountability, the wrongness of the crime, is always subjective. Kobok says that George Washington was a killer, and you argue that his case was a justifiable one- but what if he were being tried by Revolutionary-war era Britain?

War is war. I would not go off and say that just because our enemy is killing us, they are murderers. We are at war! It is justifiable to kill at war. This is also why "apologizing for war-time atrocities" is an idiotic idea. War is war, war is not nice, and there is no reason to apologize for it. There is no reason to punish those who killed at war. It is justifiable regardless. Only if you go insane and kill your own side or something, should you be punished.

Quote

They would have a different view. Indeed, had they the scientific knowledge, they would perhaps have considered the genes that influenced him to be a "rebel" (to, of course, the extent he was influenced by his genes in this regard) to be "criminal." Whereas Good Ol' American Values considers a drive to overturn distasteful and harmful aspects of society to be a good thing.

I see. Then perhaps it would benefit society to have in fact, sterilized all the crazy rebels. We would not have such problems if everybody complied with the will of the monarch.

Logged  
kobok  
Veritas Council  
Tech Team  
Posts By Osmosis  
\*\*\*\*\*  
Posts: 3885

Veritas Council

[View Profile](#)

Re: Eugenics  
« Reply #26 on: November 08, 2005, 05:13:07 PM »  
Quote from: LightLink on November 08, 2005, 04:53:17 PM  
Surely it can...if only everything was recorded we could make more accurate judgments...

No, then you just get a third perspective, that of the camera. In the above example I gave there were two people who were there, experiencing the actual tangible event, and yet they perceived different things based on their vantage-point. The camera is just a third such vantage-point.

The "Howard Dean scream" was recorded, and the recording itself was actually less accurate than the observations of people present.



The Kennedy assassination was recorded, and so now everyone draws the same conclusion, has accurate judgment, and agrees with the same objective truth? Orrr.... not.

Quote from: LightLink on November 08, 2005, 04:53:17 PM

Quote

How about a man who castrates a second man for raping and killing his sister? Because this man is you.

I do not understand.

You declared that a man who kills a man for raping and killing his sister should be castrated. So what should we do with a man who castrates a man for raping and killing his sister? Because in case you haven't noticed, this is precisely what you're proposing, you're just trying to make "society" do it, rather than you personally doing it.

Quote from: LightLink on November 08, 2005, 04:53:17 PM

Quote

How is it "playing it safe" to assume something is a problem and eliminate it without proving that it's a problem? This violates the basic premise of innocence until proven guilty.

Because it is very likely that this "something" as you call it, is a problem. It is not proven without a doubt yet, but still very likely. Why risk the chance. When one can actually help get rid of a cause of such behavior.

The best scientific evidence says that it's not likely, and that it won't significantly change the presence of such behavior. You, however, are basing your conclusion on assumptions which follow from the non-scientific myth of genetic predetermination.

Quote from: LightLink on November 08, 2005, 04:53:17 PM

Then why do people not read what I say? People need to be respectful to me and read what I say, rather than jump to baseless conclusions. It is a slap in the face to have people do such crazy things.

People can read fine, they just don't agree with you. You having discussed a topic is not the same as you having adequately refuted a point. If you want to refute something, it takes more than just telling people what you feel.

Quote from: LightLink on November 08, 2005, 04:53:17 PM

War is war. I would not go off and say that just because our enemy is killing us, they are murderers. We are at war! It is justifiable to kill at war. This is also why "apologizing for war-time atrocities" is an idiotic idea. War is war, war is not nice, and there is no reason to apologize for it. There is no reason to punish those who killed at war. It is justifiable regardless. Only if you go insane and kill your own side or something, should you be punished.

If someone breaks into your house to steal your TV, is it okay for you to shoot him and then for you to turn around and shoot your wife, or run outside and also shoot the postal carrier? This is what you're saying is okay in war. Why is immoral behavior like this suddenly okay because you've decided to rename the same action "war"?

Logged  
LightLink  
Has a lot of posts  
Veritas Furniture  
\*\*\*\*

Posts: 470

Haruka Pwns You

[View Profile](#)

Re: Eugenics

« Reply #27 on: November 08, 2005, 05:24:48 PM »

Quote

No, then you just get a third perspective, that of the camera. In the above example I gave there were two people who were there, experiencing the actual tangible event, and yet they perceived different things based on their vantage-point. The camera is just a third such vantage-point.

The "Howard Dean scream" was recorded, and the recording itself was actually less accurate than the observations of people present.

The Kennedy assassination was recorded, and so now everyone draws the same conclusion, has accurate judgment, and agrees with the same objective truth? Orrr.... not.

Glad that this is not what I mean. You know what I meant, we spoke of it already.

Quote

You declared that a man who kills a man for raping and killing his sister should be castrated. So what should we do with a man who castrates a man for raping and killing his sister? Because in case you haven't noticed, this is precisely what you're proposing, you're just trying to make "society" do it, rather than you personally doing it.

One should not take the law into their own hands. The government will do it, there is no need for you to do it yourself.

Quote

The best scientific evidence says that it's not likely, and that it won't significantly change

the presence of such behavior. You, however, are basing your conclusion on assumptions which follow from the non-scientific myth of genetic predetermination.

You sure of that? I hear from most people that who we are is actually fairly split, 50/50, between genetics and upbringing. I have never heard anything in favor of upbringing completely.

Quote

People can read fine, they just don't agree with you. You having discussed a topic is not the same as you having adequately refuted a point. If you want to refute something, it takes more than just telling people what you feel.

There is a difference between dissagreeing, and getting what I actually said completely wrong. Or repeating an argument I have already adressed.

Quote

If someone breaks into your house to steal your TV, is it okay for you to shoot him and then for you to turn around and shoot your wife, or run outside and also shoot the postal carrier? This is what you're saying is okay in war. Why is immoral behavior like this suddenly okay because you've decided to rename the same action "war"?

For example, this. I already spoke of this. This is one of the only ethical reasons for governmental punishment during war, when you attack your own side, which is what this hypothetical person is doing.

Was is war. It is different to do something in time of peace, than to do it in time of war.

Logged  
Zake  
Veritas Staff  
Veritas Moderator  
Posts By Osmosis  
\*\*\*\*\*

Posts: 1722

Veritas Staff

[View Profile](#)

Re: Eugenics

« Reply #28 on: November 08, 2005, 05:36:46 PM »

Quote from: LightLink on November 08, 2005, 04:53:17 PM

Quote

On that note, on your general point that murder, theft, rape, etc are "universal crimes";

murder is universally a crime, it can be argued, but the definition of "murder" is far from universal. There are circumstances in which it would be acceptable to kill a person (self defense, war, etc), and this is not "murder," or legally punished as such. In some such cases, it is easy to imagine, a person could well have acted with "criminal intent," or at the compulsion of "criminal genes." Inversely, it is easy to imagine cases where a person acted without "criminal intent," without "criminal genes," and such a killing would still be qualified as "murder."

Yes, this is true. And I have addressed such cases already. Self defence and war have been brought up. Others have been aswell. Read please.

Indeed, read please, LL. My point was not only that murder can be justified. The point you missed that genes which code for, say, high anger or disregard for moral (or whatever other "criminal traits" you care to quantify), can lead to terrible actions that are, nonetheless, not "crimes" in a legal sense. And, too, people with completely benign genes can commit (perhaps less) terrible actions that are crimes.

To illustrate the point clearly: The law, any system of law, is not a sufficient measure of genetic fitness, whether for "lawfulness" or any other attribute.

Logged

Act; for the universe will never forget your movement, nor will it ever forgive your stillness.

LightLink

Has a lot of posts

Veritas Furniture

\*\*\*\*

Posts: 470

Haruka Pwns You

[View Profile](#)

Re: Eugenics

« Reply #29 on: November 08, 2005, 05:39:36 PM »

Quote

Indeed, read please, LL. My point was not only that murder can be justified. The point you missed that genes which code for, say, high anger or disregard for moral (or whatever other "criminal traits" you care to quantify), can lead to terrible actions that are, nonetheless, not "crimes" in a legal sense. And, too, people with completely benign genes can commit (perhaps less) terrible actions that are crimes.

Oh. So then, you had no point? As this is irrelevant.

Quote

To illustrate the point clearly: The law, any system of law, is not a sufficient measure of genetic fitness, whether for "lawfulness" or any other attribute.

I disagree. I have stated why already, several times.

Logged

Pages: 1 [2] 3 4 ... 9Print

« previous next »

Jump to:

=> Main Hall

Powered by MySQL Powered by PHP Powered by SMF 1.1.11 | SMF © 2006-2009,  
Simple Machines LLC

Oxygen design by Bloc Valid XHTML 1.0! Valid CSS!

<http://forums.v society.net/index.php/topic%2C6825.30.html>

2 captures

7 Jul 2010 - 23 Jun 2013

Jul JUN Jul

23

2010 2013 2014

About this capture

The Veritas Society

\*

\*HomeForumsChatHelpSearchRetroLoginRegister

Welcome, Guest. Please login or register.

Did you miss your activation email?

June 23, 2013, 02:37:08 PM

Forever

Login with username, password and session length

Search:

Advanced search

209062 Posts in 14845 Topics by 18583 Members - Latest Member: - jayfk Most  
online today: 104 - most online ever: 430 (June 28, 2007, 02:58:51 PM)

+ The Veritas Society

| -+ The Auditorium

| | -+ Main Hall

| | | -+ Eugenics 0 Members and 2 Guests are viewing this topic. « previous  
next »

Pages: 1 2 [3] 4 5 ... 9 Print

Author      Topic: Eugenics   (Read 11073 times)

Zake

Veritas Staff

Veritas Moderator

Posts By Osmosis

\*\*\*\*\*

Posts: 1722

Karma: 0

Veritas Staff

[View Profile](#)

Re: Eugenics

« Reply #30 on: November 08, 2005, 05:48:42 PM »

Quote from: LightLink on November 08, 2005, 05:39:36 PM

Quote

Indeed, read please, LL. My point was not only that murder can be justified. The point you missed that genes which code for, say, high anger or disregard for moral (or whatever other "criminal traits" you care to quantify), can lead to terrible actions that are, nonetheless, not "crimes" in a legal sense. And, too, people with completely benign genes can commit (perhaps less) terrible actions that are crimes.

Oh. So then, you had no point? As this is irrelevant.

Quote

To illustrate the point clearly: The law, any system of law, is not a sufficient measure of genetic fitness, whether for "lawfulness" or any other attribute.

I disagree. I have stated why already, several times.

If that is the case, I cannot find your arguments against this point, or consider them to be insufficient. Please re-state them- re-iteration is 90% of any debate cool.

Logged

Act; for the universe will never forget your movement, nor will it ever forgive your stillness.

LightLink

Has a lot of posts

Veritas Furniture

\*\*\*\*

Posts: 470

Karma: 0

[View Profile](#)

Re: Eugenics

« Reply #31 on: November 08, 2005, 07:06:50 PM »

The law is an adequate gauge of genetic fitness, as it is illegal in every society to rape, steal, and murder, and this is because these things are detrimental to society. Thus, if you do them, you are inferior, and we must get rid of any and all genes that would contribute to it.

Logged

kakkarot

0. The Fool... Inverted?

Posts By Osmosis

\*\*\*\*\*

Posts: 2701

Karma: 3

Pirate "Not-A-Mod" BoB

[View Profile](#)

Re: Eugenics

« Reply #32 on: November 08, 2005, 07:08:23 PM »

Quote

You are dumb. Go away. It is impossible that you know anything of what I am saying, or else you would not ask such inane questions. Murder is a universal crime. Theft is a universal crime. Rape is aswell. There are of course, justifiable reasons for these 3, and that is mostly universal aswell (war) and as such it matters not at that time. The point is, is that every crime I bring up are pretty much, universal. That would be because they are inherently bad to society, so every society has outlawed them.

Right, first off calling me dumb doesn't make it true. Just as saying that murder and rape are in the genes doesn't make it true. I'll forgive you this time.

Nextly, murder and even rape are actually NOT universally outlawed; there are countries which not only allow them, but guess what? use them as punishments of criminals/percieved-criminals. Have you never heard the few stories which make the news about women in africa being raped, even to death, because a JUDGE orders it?

And lastly, prove that people who haven't performed actions such as murder and rape

DON'T carry such genes. Because if we do carry such genes, then how can you know that when you're castrating a criminal that you're actually cleaning the gene-pool from when you're simply castrating people because they do things you don't like?

Prove that I don't carry a murder&rape gene. If I do, then even if I don't murder or rape anyone you're ideology says that I should be castrated. But if the whole world carries that gene, ie if it's a common gene which all humanity has, then your entire argument is pointless because it's like saying that you should "castrate all males who have penises because it's the penises which allow them to rape".

~kakkarot

« Last Edit: November 08, 2005, 07:10:22 PM by kakkarot » Logged

Philippians 2:5 Your attitude should be the same as that of Christ Jesus: 6 Who, being in very nature God, did not consider equality with God something to be grasped, 7 but made himself nothing, taking the very nature of a servant, being made in human likeness.

LightLink

Has a lot of posts

Veritas Furniture

\*\*\*\*

Posts: 470

Karma: 0

[View Profile](#)

Re: Eugenics

« Reply #33 on: November 08, 2005, 07:44:02 PM »

Quote

Right, first off calling me dumb doesn't make it true. Just as saying that murder and rape are in the genes doesn't make it true. I'll forgive you this time.

No, it does not, but it sure does make me feel better, getting rid of all that pent up hatred for people not reading.

Quote

Nextly, murder and even rape are actually NOT universally outlawed; there are countries which not only allow them, but guess what? use them as punishments of criminals/percieved-criminals.

Have you never heard the few stories which make the news about women in africa being raped, even to death, because a JUDGE orders it?

Then it is obviously not murder, as murder is not legal. This is simply another exception.



Even america has the death penalty, which to some is "murder" (let us forget that it is in fact, not murder) as punishment. Punishment is not anything other than punishment. Killing is bad, but there are cases in which it is fine, and these are not really murder.

Quote

And lastly, prove that people who haven't performed actions such as murder and rape DON'T carry such genes. Because if we do carry such genes, then how can you know that when you're castrating a criminal that you're actually cleaning the gene-pool from when you're simply castrating people because they do things you don't like?

You cannot prove a negative. Great logic there. Aswell, I adressed this with the castration of the children of the murderer, as this would help ensure that you eradicate the genes, but it is unethical. If you are so willing to make sure, then that is what you would simply have to do.

And finally, if you castrate people who do things you do not like, you will help get rid of genes that cause that which you do not like. Let us say you do not like scientifically "stupid" people. Through many generations, certainly you would have a decrease in the amount of those who are scientifically "stupid" and an increase in those that are. You may end up having something bad happen too, like a decrease in artistically talented people or what have you, but you do not care because you helped get rid of a trait you do not like.

Quote

Prove that I don't carry a murder&rape gene. If I do, then even if I don't murder or rape anyone you're ideology says that I should be castrated. But if the whole world carries that gene, ie if it's a common gene which all humanity has, then your entire arguement is pointless because it's like saying that you should "castrate all males who have penises because it's the penises which allow them to rape".

Cannot prove a negative.

No, my ideology says that you should be castrated for doing the murder, and in doing so, you help clean the gene pool. You are simply being idiotic, bringing up idiotic things like this. It is unethical to punish those who have done nothing. Not only this, but I have already spoken of this! There can be other genes that can counteract such things, and thus if we were to get rid of the person, we would get rid of the good genes along with the bad. Not only that, but there are undoubtedly more than one gene that would cause such behaviour, and just because you have one does not do anything. It is safer to wait for it to manifest than it is to be stupid and go "snip, you have a penis!"

Logged  
kobok  
Veritas Council  
Tech Team  
Posts By Osmosis

\*\*\*\*\*

Posts: 4766

Karma: 150

Veritas Council

[View Profile](#)

Re: Eugenics

« Reply #34 on: November 08, 2005, 09:08:22 PM »

Quote from: LightLink on November 08, 2005, 05:24:48 PM

Quote

You declared that a man who kills a man for raping and killing his sister should be castrated. So what should we do with a man who castrates a man for raping and killing his sister? Because in case you haven't noticed, this is precisely what you're proposing, you're just trying to make "society" do it, rather than you personally doing it.

One should not take the law into their own hands. The government will do it, there is no need for you to do it yourself.

An action does not become moral simply because the government does it instead of the individual.

Quote from: LightLink on November 08, 2005, 05:24:48 PM

Quote

The best scientific evidence says that it's not likely, and that it won't significantly change the presence of such behavior. You, however, are basing your conclusion on assumptions which follow from the non-scientific myth of genetic predetermination.

You sure of that? I hear from most people that who we are is actually fairly split, 50/50, between genetics and upbringing. I have never heard anything in favor of upbringing completely.

The split between genetics and upbringing is only about 50/50 for simple and elementary attributes. If you want to talk about "intelligence" or "athletic endurance", then things such as this can be predicted about 50% by heredity and 50% by upbringing. If, however, you talk about complex attributes such as "ability to program in assembly language" or "tendency to brush ones teeth" or "tendency to strangle people to death in dark basements", then you are talking about specific complex behaviors which are mostly upbringing, and much less genetic.

At the very best, there are genetic tendencies such as "aggression" which are loosely correlated with crime, but aggression itself is not an unfavorable trait, since there are

times when the aggressive members of a species are the ones responsible for the survival of that species. Eliminating this would be counterproductive, and would not necessarily reduce crime, but potentially make mankind more vulnerable to it.

Quote from: LightLink on November 08, 2005, 05:24:48 PM

Quote

If someone breaks into your house to steal your TV, is it okay for you to shoot him and then for you to turn around and shoot your wife, or run outside and also shoot the postal carrier? This is what you're saying is okay in war. Why is immoral behavior like this suddenly okay because you've decided to rename the same action "war"?

For example, this. I already spoke of this. This is one of the only ethical reasons for governmental punishment during war, when you attack your own side, which is what this hypothetical person is doing.

Was is war. It is different to do something in time of peace, than to do it in time of war.

It means nothing to say "war is war", it only means that you are making a special exemption without a reason.

You have just proposed the hypothesis that it is immoral to shoot a postal carrier near you, but that it is morally acceptable to go over to Iraq and shoot an innocent postal carrier or a random man's wife, simply because it is "war"? How is it more moral to shoot people with an address farther away from your own?

(And what's more, how does this difference derive from genetics, as you are proposing it does?)

Quote from: LightLink

You are simply being idiotic, bringing up idiotic things like this

This is your last warning, LightLink. You will not insult the debaters in the process of debating the topic, or you will be banned.

Logged

Want to learn psi? Check out our collection of psi articles.

SleepWalker

Pool Boy

Posts By Osmosis

\*\*\*\*\*

Posts: 588

Karma: 1

Pinkus Elefantus

[View Profile](#)

Re: Eugenics

« Reply #35 on: November 08, 2005, 11:26:21 PM »

Yes, definitely nominating yourself as the new Hitler.

Please continue to be insulting to people, as your way is the way correct?

Others must be inferior, they do not abide by your laws.

hail LL.

People don't generally feel it necessary to point out the flaws so precisely for the simple reason that it should be blatantly obvious to you.

If you don't understand the concepts of justice, virtue and vindictiveness it is not anyone else's fault but your own.

I would recommend you take a nice long hard look at yourself LL.

The thing that needs fixing most here is you.

Logged

How can you explain freedom, never having experienced it.

From the moment we are born we conform to the physical world. In narrow awareness of all that there is to perceive.

Try Tachyon[URL

solstice

Dreamwalker

Posts By Osmosis

\*\*\*\*\*

Posts: 2114

Karma: -5

"Receive and transmit..."

[View Profile](#)

Re: Eugenics

« Reply #36 on: November 09, 2005, 06:57:13 AM »

Quote from: Lightlink

Then it is obviously not murder, as murder is not legal. This is simply another exception.

Even america has the death penalty, which to some is "murder" (let us forget that it is in fact, not murder) as punishment. Punishment is not anything other than punishment.

Killing is bad, but there are cases in which it is fine, and these are not really murder.

Lightlink, I want you to read this very carefully, okay? Don't question, until after you understand the meaning of the passage:

The unlawful and malicious, or premeditated killing of a human being by another...

Taken from Webster's New World Dictionary, page 967, first definition.

What do you think Webster's is trying to say, in that passage?

According to that, ANY killing with intent is murder, regardless of the reason. This means calling something a punishment, does not negate it from being murder: there for, murder by the government or some jealous husband are the same thing.

Logged

Tell all the Truth but tell it slant: Success in Circuit lies. Too bright for our infirm Delight. The Truth's superb surprise. As Lightning to the Children eased, with explanation kind. The Truth must dazzle gradually, or every man be blind.

Tefeari: The Giant Impact Hypothesis is a theory

kobok

Veritas Council

Tech Team

Posts By Osmosis

\*\*\*\*\*

Posts: 4766

Karma: 150

Veritas Council

[View Profile](#)

Re: Eugenics

« Reply #37 on: November 09, 2005, 10:21:20 AM »

Quote from: solstice on November 09, 2005, 06:57:13 AM

Quote from: Lightlink

Then it is obviously not murder, as murder is not legal. This is simply another exception. Even america has the death penalty, which to some is "murder" (let us forget that it is in fact, not murder) as punishment. Punishment is not anything other than punishment. Killing is bad, but there are cases in which it is fine, and these are not realy murder. Lightlink, I want you to read this very carefully, okay? Dont question, until after you understood the meaning of the passage:

The unlawful and malicious, or premeditaed killing of a human being by another...

Taken from Webster's New World Dictionary, page 967, first definition.

What do you think Webster's is trying to say, in that passage?

According to that, ANY killing with intent is murder, regardless of the reason. This means calling something a punishment, does not negate it from being murder: there for, murder by the government or some jealous husband are the same thing.

You missed "unlawful", which is an "out" for the first portion of the definition which lets

people declare things like the holocaust "not-murder" simply by legalizing them. But lets not get sidetracked here. The point is not what a dictionary says, but whether or not the moral essence and effects of the action are the same.

« Last Edit: November 09, 2005, 10:24:29 AM by kobok »      Logged

Want to learn psi? Check out our collection of psi articles.

kakkarot

0. The Fool... Inverted?

Posts By Osmosis

\*\*\*\*\*

Posts: 2701

Karma: 3

Pirate "Not-A-Mod" BoB

View Profile

Re: Eugenics

« Reply #38 on: November 09, 2005, 10:28:12 AM »

"Then it is obviously not murder, as murder is not legal." So that's the difference between murder and not-murder? Well then, let's just rewrite the laws so that killing in general is completely legal and then you don't have to worry about your eugenics stuff. Or maybe we can instead make \*everything\* that we don't like illegal and then start killing everyone who has any sort of gene that we don't like, because it's legal.

Oh wait.. maybe.... just maybe.. murder refers to "consciously killing another human being" rather than "the illegal killing of a human being". Oh, but of course you get around this by defining when murder is "allowed" and when it is not. Wow, great logic there.

<http://laws.justice.gc.ca/en/C-46/42644.html#section-229> Good thing America doesn't own the world Cheesy

And on the topic of logic: I said "And lastly, prove that people who haven't performed actions such as murder and rape DON'T carry such genes." To which you replied: "You cannot prove a negative. Great logic there." This is an incorrect use of the "cannot prove a negative" logic, as we CAN determine every single gene in a human being and therefore we can tell which genes a person does have and which they do not have. In retrospect, how do you propose that we absolutely \*know\* that someone has a murder or rape gene if we, according to your statement about not being able to know whether a person has a certain gene or not, cannot tell what genes they have or do not have?

Because, according to you, only the people with those genes should be castrated, so

you have to be able to determine whether they have those genes or not. If they do, according to you they should be castrated. If they don't, according to you they can be left alone. Now, if you can determine through genetic testing that a person has said gene, then how is it that through genetic testing you cannot prove that a person doesn't have that gene? If you can prove they have it, and you can map the entire genome (which we can), then you can prove that another person doesn't have it.

So you copped out by finally going to the actions instead of the genetics. Well, guess what? We already punish the actions, and simply castrating one or two thousand people out of a few million who still carry the supposed gene but do not act upon it will not clean the gene pool. Once again, you don't seem to understand the unrealistic nature of what you're proposing.

~kakkarot

« Last Edit: November 09, 2005, 10:36:00 AM by kakkarot » Logged

Philippians 2:5 Your attitude should be the same as that of Christ Jesus: 6 Who, being in very nature God, did not consider equality with God something to be grasped, 7 but made himself nothing, taking the very nature of a servant, being made in human likeness.

solstice

Dreamwalker

Posts By Osmosis

\*\*\*\*\*

Posts: 2114

Karma: -5

"Receive and transmit..."

[View Profile](#)

Re: Eugenics

« Reply #39 on: November 09, 2005, 11:07:17 AM »

Quote

You missed "unlawful", which is an "out" for the first portion of the definition which lets people declare things like the holocaust "not-murder" simply by legalizing them. But lets not get sidetracked here. The point is not what a dictionary says, but whether or not the moral essence and effects of the action are the same.

No, I believe the entry was "unlawful and malicious OR premeditated.." Which means it can mean either concept. Why are you disagreeing with me? I am not the Nazi lol

« Last Edit: November 09, 2005, 11:16:57 AM by solstice » Logged

Tell all the Truth but tell it slant: Success in Circuit lies. Too bright for our infirm Delight. The Truth's superb surprise. As Lightning to the Children eased, with

explanation kind. The Truth must dazzle gradually, or every man be blind.

Tefeari: The Giant Impact Hypothesis is a theory

LightLink

Has a lot of posts

Veritas Furniture

\*\*\*\*

Posts: 470

Karma: 0

[View Profile](#)

Re: Eugenics

« Reply #40 on: November 09, 2005, 03:33:12 PM »

Quote

An action does not become moral simply because the government does it instead of the individual.

And you are right. I never said it was really immoral for the person to take revenge, it is just, that is what the law is for. We have the death penalty, yet if you killed somebody who killed a family member, you go to jail because what you did was against the law, even if it is ethical.

Quote

The split between genetics and upbringing is only about 50/50 for simple and elementary attributes. If you want to talk about "intelligence" or "athletic endurance", then things such as this can be predicted about 50% by heredity and 50% by upbringing. If, however, you talk about complex attributes such as "ability to program in assembly language" or "tendency to brush ones teeth" or "tendency to strangle people to death in dark basements", then you are talking about specific complex behaviors which are mostly upbringing, and much less genetic.

Ah I see, but you concede that it has at least a bit to do with genetics? Then just to get rid of that little bit, it is worth it.

Quote

At the very best, there are genetic tendencies such as "aggression" which are loosely correlated with crime, but aggression itself is not an unfavorable trait, since there are times when the aggressive members of a species are the ones responsible for the survival of that species. Eliminating this would be counterproductive, and would not necessarily reduce crime, but potentially make mankind more vulnerable to it.

Aggression is not the only thing that causes crime. Stupidity is a big one, whether due to bad upbringing or...they are just stupid. As well as a few other things. Aggressive



people can still lead productive criminal free lives.

Quote

It means nothing to say "war is war", it only means that you are making a special exemption without a reason.

The reason is that war is war! You are trying to kill them there! You are trying to win.

Quote

You have just proposed the hypothesis that it is immoral to shoot a postal carrier near you, but that it is morally acceptable to go over to Iraq and shoot an innocent postal carrier or a random man's wife, simply because it is "war"? How is it more moral to shoot people with an address farther away from your own?

War happens. When you are at war you wish to win the war, and a part of war is partaking in the spoils, things like rape and pillaging, and looting. When in war, this stuff happens, and because you are in a war, it is justified. It is not pretty, but it is reality.

Quote

And what's more, how does this difference derive from genetics, as you are proposing it does?

It does not. It is simply okay during war.

Quote

This is your last warning, LightLink. You will not insult the debaters in the process of debating the topic, or you will be banned.

There is a difference between acting idiotic, and being an idiot, having idiotic responses, and being an idiot.

Why do you not make good arguments here, as you did in chat? Sure, some of this is fine, but hypothetical situations being proposed left and right does nothing.

Quote

Yes, definitely nominating yourself as the new Hitler.

Please continue to be insulting to people, as your way is the way correct?

Others must be inferior, they do not abide by your laws.

Lol. It is sad, that this is true(minus the hitler part). Although I do try to not insult people but sometimes it is such a slap in the face for people to not read, or to have crazy ideas.

Quote

hail LL.

W00t.

Quote

People don't generally feel it necessary to point out the flaws so precisely for the simple reason that it should be blatantly obvious to you.

The problem is, is there are some flaws, but that is just because not everything is perfect. These people are not pointing out the flaws, so much as bringing up hypothetical questions to determine the ethics of something. Why do they not go against the death penalty for such things? Atleast with this, you get to live! I do not propose "the perfect system" nearly a better one. And pointing out that everything is not always peachy and flowery with fluffy kittens is not doing anything productive.

Quote

If you don't understand the concepts of justice, virtue and vindictiveness it is not anyone else's fault but your own.

I think it is you who do not understand these concepts.

Quote

The thing that needs fixing most here is you.

Nice one.

Quote

"Then it is obviously not murder, as murder is not legal." So that's the difference between murder and not-murder?

Duh. Murder is illegal killing. Or did you not know that?

Quote

Well then, let's just rewrite the laws so that killing in general is completely legal and then you don't have to worry about your eugenics stuff. Or maybe we can instead make \*everything\* that we don't like illegal and then start killing everyone who has any sort of gene that we don't like, because it's legal.

This is what I mean. Of course everything we do not like is illegal, that is why it is illegal! We do not like murder, rape, stealing, cheating, abuse, molestation, ect. so we make them illegal! What do you think the purpose of laws are? And we need punishment, and castration is better than death.

Quote

Oh wait.. maybe.... just maybe.. murder refers to "consciously killing another human being" rather than "the illegal killing of a human being". Oh, but of course you get

around this by defining when murder is "allowed" and when it is not. Wow, great logic there.

No, murder is illegal. It does not matter if it is conscious or not. All murder is killing, not all killing is murder. Understand that.

Quote

And on the topic of logic: I said "And lastly, prove that people who haven't performed actions such as murder and rape DON'T carry such genes." To which you replied: "You cannot prove a negative. Great logic there." This is an incorrect use of the "cannot prove a negative" logic, as we CAN determine every single gene in a human being and therefore we can tell which genes a person does have and which they do not have.

Not yet we can't. It would take years to sequence the entire DNA of a person. Just one. And there are undoubtedly many many things that contribute to such crime. And we do not even know what they are either! So in fact, no, we can not prove this negative.

Quote

In retrospect, how do you propose that we absolutely \*know\* that someone has a murder or rape gene if we, according to your statement about not being able to know whether a person has a certain gene or not, cannot tell what genes they have or do not have?

They murder and rape. Duh.

Quote

Because, according to you, only the people with those genes should be castrated, so you have to be able to determine whether they have those genes or not. If they do, according to you they should be castrated. If they don't, according to you they can be left alone.

I never said anything like this. I will stop replying to you if you keep this up. I said, people who do such crimes should be castrated. I actively went against what you just said twice now. We should do something, when they do something. We do not know for certain that just because they have it, they will do it.

So, not if they have the genes! Only if they do it! Understand?

Quote

Now, if you can determine through genetic testing that a person has said gene, then how is it that through genetic testing you cannot prove that a person doesn't have that gene? If you can prove they have it, and you can map the entire genome (which we can), then you can prove that another person doesn't have it.

We have mapped the entire genome, but we have not a clue what they all do, and we are not about to do it all again. Sequencing every single strand takes time. Thus, we can not prove that they have it, nor that they do not, the point is, is that they committed a bad crime, should be punished, genes contributed to the crime even if in a small way, so we can kill two birds with one stone.

Quote

So you copped out by finally going to the actions instead of the genetics. Well, guess what? We already punish the actions, and simply castrating one or two thousand people out of a few million who still carry the supposed gene but do not act upon it will not clean the gene pool. Once again, you don't seem to understand the unrealistic nature of what you're proposing.

I spoke of this too. Twice now. I said it was unethical to really purge the genepool. The way we could \*really\* do it would be to say, castrate anybody who is directly related to the convict. Parents, siblings, children. That would make sure. It would get cleaned out that way. Is it ethical? They have done nothing, so no.

What I say, is that this helps. More so than doing nothing at all.

Quote

No, I believe the entry was "unlawful and malicious OR premeditated.." Which means it can mean either concept. Why are you disagreeing with me? I am not the Nazi lol

Did I not call you a Nazi in chat just yesterday, and you took offence? And here you are doing it to me. Good thing I do not care. What I do care about though is the double standard. Either change the rules, or obey them. Or do not obey them and just do not bother me.

Now, ontopic, this is wrong. Murder is a legal defnition, it has to be against the law to be considered "murder." If you wish to be generic, the word "killing" does exist.

But like Kobok said, it is the ethics of it, which I responded too. It is equally ethical regardless of who did it, but we have laws to keep people from taking things into their own hands.

« Last Edit: November 09, 2005, 04:54:11 PM by LightLink » Logged

kakkarot

0. The Fool... Inverted?

Posts By Osmosis

\*\*\*\*\*

Posts: 2701

Karma: 3

Pirate "Not-A-Mod" BoB

[View Profile](#)

Re: Eugenics

« Reply #41 on: November 09, 2005, 03:56:10 PM »

HOLY FUCK, how do you do this without realizing it?

First you said: "Not yet we can't. It would take years to sequence the entire DNA of a person. Just one."

And \*then\* you said: "We have mapped the entire genome"

You don't understand anything you're saying, do you?

"Of course everything we do not like is illegal, that is why it is illegal!" Not quite. Things that are detrimental to a person's health become illegal, unless the majority of the people demand it remain legal (ie, cigarettes and alcohol). Little kids are annoying brats and I don't like them, but even if the majority of the people didn't like them they wouldn't become illegal just because people don't like them. There's a huge difference. And even if you go the route of "legal killing" versus "illegal killing" there's NO FUCKING WAY that your genes can tell the difference between killing that's legal and killing that's illegal. So the cop who kills has the same genes, according to you, as the killer who gets shot (and dies) by the cop. Brilliant. Abso-fucking-lutely brilliant. So now you have to castrate the cop because he's got the killing gene.

I think it's I who will stop replying to you now.

~kakkarot

Logged

Philippians 2:5 Your attitude should be the same as that of Christ Jesus: 6 Who, being in very nature God, did not consider equality with God something to be grasped, 7 but made himself nothing, taking the very nature of a servant, being made in human likeness.

LightLink

Has a lot of posts

Veritas Furniture

\*\*\*\*

Posts: 470

Karma: 0

[View Profile](#)

Re: Eugenics

« Reply #42 on: November 09, 2005, 05:02:31 PM »

Quote

First you said: "Not yet we can't. It would take years to sequence the entire DNA of a person. Just one."

And \*then\* you said: "We have mapped the entire genome"

After this, I refuse to talk to you any longer.

We did it. It took us what, 10 years? What did I say? "It would take years to...." That is for one person. We would have to do it all over again to somebody to see if they personally have something. And that is assuming we know what every single little code does, which we do not.

Quote

Things that are detrimental to a person's health become illegal, unless the majority of the people demand it remain legal (ie, cigarettes and alcohol).

We as a people do not like people hurting themselves, so it is illegal. But if that changes, it might be legal. As in, if they suddenly like it. You just proved me.

Quote

Little kids are annoying brats and I don't like them, but even if the majority of the people didn't like them they wouldn't become illegal just because people don't like them. There's a huge difference.

That would be because even if the majority of people did not like children, they would also not like dying as a species.

Quote

So the cop who kills has the same genes, according to you, as the killer who gets shot (and dies) by the cop. Brilliant. Abso-fucking-lutely brilliant. So now you have to castrate the cop because he's got the killing gene.

Not certainly. But let us assume they do have similar enough genes that they meet what you are saying.

1 - The reason the killer did it is much much different then the cop. The cop did it out of self defence. (a cop cannot kill the killer any other way and it be legal)

2 - The killer was most defignitely not feeling fearfull for his life when the killing took place. (Assuming an actual malicious murder anyway)

Quote

I think it's I who will stop replying to you now.

Thank you.

Logged  
kobok  
Veritas Council  
Tech Team  
Posts By Osmosis  
\*\*\*\*\*

Posts: 4766  
Karma: 150

Veritas Council

[View Profile](#)

Re: Eugenics

« Reply #43 on: November 09, 2005, 05:53:29 PM »

Quote from: LightLink on November 09, 2005, 03:33:12 PM

Quote

The split between genetics and upbringing is only about 50/50 for simple and elementary attributes. If you want to talk about "intelligence" or "athletic endurance", then things such as this can be predicted about 50% by heredity and 50% by upbringing. If, however, you talk about complex attributes such as "ability to program in assembly language" or "tendency to brush ones teeth" or "tendency to strangle people to death in dark basements", then you are talking about specific complex behaviors which are mostly upbringing, and much less genetic.

Ah I see, but you concede that it has at least a bit to do with genetics? Then just to get rid of that little bit, it is worth it.

You say "just to get rid of that little bit, it is worth it", as if an insignificantly small correlation between criminal behavior and genetic tendencies toward aggression is worth CASTRATING PEOPLE? Do you think there is no detriment to society, or to the members of society, if it starts castrating people?

Quote from: LightLink on November 09, 2005, 03:33:12 PM

Quote

It means nothing to say "war is war", it only means that you are making a special exemption without a reason.

The reason is that war is war! You are trying to kill them there! You are trying to win.

Quote

You have just proposed the hypothesis that it is immoral to shoot a postal carrier near you, but that it is morally acceptable to go over to Iraq and shoot an innocent postal carrier or a random man's wife, simply because it is "war"? How is it more moral to shoot people with an address farther away from your own?

War happens. When you are at war you wish to win the war, and a part of war is partaking in the spoils, things like rape and pillaging, and looting. When in war, this stuff happens, and because you are in a war, it is justified. It is not pretty, but it is reality.

"The reason is that crime is crime! You are trying to commit crime! You are trying to get stuff and feel better!

Crime happens. When you are committing crime, you wish to get stuff and hurt people, and a part of crime is partaking in the spoils, things like rape and pillaging, and looting. When committing crime, this stuff happens, and because you are committing crime, it is justified. It is not pretty, but it is reality."

Gee, the above sounds pretty ridiculous when I put the word "crime" in there, now doesn't it. But it sounds equally ridiculous with the word "war" in there. You can't justify immoral behavior by just saying, "That's what people want to do."

Quote from: LightLink on November 09, 2005, 03:33:12 PM  
And we need punishment, and castration is better than death.

Lifetime incarceration is more moral, cheaper, and more fool-proof against false-convictions than either of the above options.

Quote from: LightLink on November 09, 2005, 03:33:12 PM  
Quote

In retrospect, how do you propose that we absolutely \*know\* that someone has a murder or rape gene if we, according to your statement about not being able to know whether a person has a certain gene or not, cannot tell what genes they have or do not have?

They murder and rape. Duh.

Do you know what percentage of people who commit murder also had a parent who committed murder? Seriously, find a percentage. I'd also like to hear what your personal estimate for this is.

Would it surprise you to learn that single-parent families and unemployment are usually the largest predictors of violent crime, and not a parental history of violent crime? These are environmental factors, and this demonstrates quite convincingly that most



violent crime is not hereditary. In comparison, you have still not demonstrated that it is.

Quote from: LightLink on November 09, 2005, 03:33:12 PM

What I say, is that this helps. Moreso than doing nothing at all.

But at the cost to society of opening the doors to cruel and unusual punishment. Surgically altering people against their will, and removing people's body parts against their will, are not things a civilized society should engage in. This does not provide any significant contribution toward preventing future offenses, but is instead cruelly punitive.

Logged

Want to learn psi? Check out our collection of psi articles.

LightLink

Has a lot of posts

Veritas Furniture

\*\*\*\*

Posts: 470

Karma: 0

[View Profile](#)

Re: Eugenics

« Reply #44 on: November 09, 2005, 06:29:06 PM »

Quote

You say "just to get rid of that little bit, it is worth it", as if an insignificantly small correlation between criminal behavior and genetic tendencies toward aggression is worth CASTRATING PEOPLE? Do you think there is no detriment to society, or to the members of society, if it starts castrating people?

You make castration out to be such a horrible thing in response for rape and murder. But oh, it seems lifetime imprisonment, where you can not do must of anything you wish, and killing, is perfectly justified. How so?

I see no problem with castration. It is no more detrimental than society imprisoning and killing people.

Quote

Gee, the above sounds pretty ridiculous when I put the word "crime" in there, now doesn't it. But it sounds equally ridiculous with the word "war" in there. You can't justify immoral behavior by just saying, "That's what people want to do."

I am only trying to justify not punishing people for war. War is fairly unethical, just like crime. But it is insane to suggest punishing your soldiers! Or to just...not protect yourself or something. War happens. Crime happens. Both are unethical, but you cannot

punish people for war, if they are your own people.

Quote

Lifetime incarceration is more moral, cheaper, and more fool-proof against false-convictions than either of the above options.

I do not agree at all. I think lifetime incarceration is fairly unethical. I can not do a darn thing I want. I have to get raped by greasy people in showers. I have to be told when to eat, sleep, and use the restroom. I have no freedom at all. And it is for the rest of my life. It is worse than death.

The citizens pay for constant room and board for criminals. They get free shelter and food for the rest of their life. That is expensive.

How is it more foolproof? You get tried before a punishment is carried out! In both situations, you get tried, get convicted, and then something different happens. Permanent incarceration and castration offer no difference in freedom against false-convictions.

Quote

Do you know what percentage of people who commit murder also had a parent who committed murder? Seriously, find a percentage. I'd also like to hear what your personal estimate for this is.

It is probably close to zero. It does not make sense for people to commit murder to have parents that do it aswell.

Quote

Would it surprise you to learn that single-parent families and unemployment are usually the largest predictors of violent crime, and not a parental history of violent crime? These are environmental factors, and this demonstrates quite convincingly that most violent crime is not hereditary. In comparison, you have still not demonstrated that it is.

No, I would not be surprised it makes sense. Given that some people cannot think enough to figure out how to get out of such a situation, and are so pathetic that they get all sad and angry from having one parent.

In comparison, would it not be an interesting hypothesis to say that the difference between the people who are unemployed/have a single-parent family and commit murder, and the ones who are unemployed/have a single-parent family and do not commit murder is a genetic one? Of course, counting in other environmental factors. But even then, the ones who have everything in common with a killer, but did not kill, most likely have a genetic difference.

Quote

But at the cost to society of opening the doors to cruel and unusual punishment.

Surgically altering people against their will, and removing people's body parts against their will, are not things a civilized society should engage in. This does not provide any significant contribution toward preventing future offenses, but is instead cruelly punitive.

And what in the world does incarcerating people against their will, or killing them against their will, or taking their money, or putting them in an asylum, do? Does it give a significant contribution? No, we do not even try to rehabilitate most criminals. And if you are sick in the head, you are sick in the head. It is not common to be "fixed" from such things. Is it cruel and unusual? Just as much as castration. At least with castration, I can still live, and do what I want after I get out of "prison." (as lifetime incarceration is unethical)

And how does any of the things we do not prevent future offences? Atleast castration would get rid of tons of testosterone, which will change their their chemistry and make them more passive.

Logged

Pages: 1 2 [3] 4 5 ... 9      Print

« previous next »

Jump to:

=> Main Hall

Powered by MySQL Powered by PHP    Powered by SMF 1.1.18 | SMF © 2013, Simple Machines

Oxygen design by Bloc    Valid XHTML 1.0! Valid CSS!

<http://forums.vociety.net/index.php/topic%2C6825.30.html>

2 captures

7 Jul 2010 - 23 Jun 2013

Jul    JUN    Jul

23

2010   2013   2014

About this capture

The Veritas Society

\*

\*HomeForumsChatHelpSearchRetroLoginRegister

Welcome, Guest. Please login or register.

Did you miss your activation email?

June 23, 2013, 02:37:08 PM

Forever

Login with username, password and session length

Search:

Advanced search

209062 Posts in 14845 Topics by 18583 Members - Latest Member: - jayfk      Most  
online today: 104 - most online ever: 430 (June 28, 2007, 02:58:51 PM)

+ The Veritas Society

|-+ The Auditorium

| |-+ Main Hall

|| |-+ Eugenics      0 Members and 2 Guests are viewing this topic.      « previous  
next »

Pages: 1 2 [3] 4 5 ... 9      Print

Author      Topic: Eugenics    (Read 11073 times)

Zake

Veritas Staff

Veritas Moderator

Posts By Osmosis

\*\*\*\*\*

Posts: 1722

Karma: 0

Veritas Staff

View Profile

Re: Eugenics

« Reply #30 on: November 08, 2005, 05:48:42 PM »

Quote from: LightLink on November 08, 2005, 05:39:36 PM

Quote

Indeed, read please, LL.    My point was not only that murder can be justified.    The point you missed that genes which code for, say, high anger or disregard for moral (or whatever other "criminal traits" you care to quantify), can lead to terrible actions that are, nonetheless, not "crimes" in a legal sense.    And, too, people with completely benign genes can commit (perhaps less) terrible actions that are crimes.

Oh. So then, you had no point? As this is irrelevant.

Quote

To illustrate the point clearly:    The law, any system of law, is not a sufficient measure of genetic fitness, whether for "lawfulness" or any other attribute.

I disagree. I have stated why already, several times.

If that is the case, I cannot find your arguments against this point, or consider them to be insufficient. Please re-state them- re-iteration is 90% of any debate cool.

Logged

Act; for the universe will never forget your movement, nor will it ever forgive your stillness.

LightLink

Has a lot of posts

Veritas Furniture

\*\*\*\*

Posts: 470

Karma: 0

[View Profile](#)

Re: Eugenics

« Reply #31 on: November 08, 2005, 07:06:50 PM »

The law is an adequate gauge of genetic fitness, as it is illegal in every society to rape, steal, and murder, and this is because these things are detrimental to society. Thus, if you do them, you are inferior, and we must get rid of any and all genes that would contribute to it.

Logged

kakkarot

0. The Fool... Inverted?

Posts By Osmosis

\*\*\*\*\*

Posts: 2701

Karma: 3

Pirate "Not-A-Mod" BoB

[View Profile](#)

Re: Eugenics

« Reply #32 on: November 08, 2005, 07:08:23 PM »

Quote

You are dumb. Go away. It is impossible that you know anything of what I am saying, or else you would not ask such inane questions. Murder is a universal crime. Theft is a

universal crime. Rape is aswell. There are of course, justifiable reasons for these 3, and that is mostly universal aswell (war) and as such it matters not at that time. The point is, is that every crime I bring up are pretty much, universal. That would be because they are inherently bad to society, so every society has outlawed them.

Right, first off calling me dumb doesn't make it true. Just as saying that murder and rape are in the genes doesn't make it true. I'll forgive you this time.

Nextly, murder and even rape are actually NOT universally outlawed; there are countries which not only allow them, but guess what? use them as punishments of criminals/percieved-criminals. Have you never heard the few stories which make the news about women in africa being raped, even to death, because a JUDGE orders it?

And lastly, prove that people who haven't performed actions such as murder and rape DON'T carry such genes. Because if we do carry such genes, then how can you know that when you're castrating a criminal that you're actually cleaning the gene-pool from when you're simply castrating people because they do things you don't like?

Prove that I don't carry a murder&rape gene. If I do, then even if I don't murder or rape anyone you're ideology says that I should be castrated. But if the whole world carries that gene, ie if it's a common gene which all humanity has, then your entire argument is pointless because it's like saying that you should "castrate all males who have penises because it's the penises which allow them to rape".

~kakkarot

« Last Edit: November 08, 2005, 07:10:22 PM by kakkarot »    Logged

Philippians 2:5 Your attitude should be the same as that of Christ Jesus: 6 Who, being in very nature God, did not consider equality with God something to be grasped, 7 but made himself nothing, taking the very nature of a servant, being made in human likeness.

LightLink

Has a lot of posts

Veritas Furniture

\*\*\*\*

Posts: 470

Karma: 0

[View Profile](#)

Re: Eugenics

« Reply #33 on: November 08, 2005, 07:44:02 PM »

Quote

Right, first off calling me dumb doesn't make it true. Just as saying that murder and rape

are in the genes doesn't make it true. I'll forgive you this time.

No, it does not, but it sure does make me feel better, getting rid of all that pent up hatred for people not reading.

Quote

Nextly, murder and even rape are actually NOT universally outlawed; there are countries which not only allow them, but guess what? use them as punishments of criminals/percieved-criminals.

Have you never heard the few stories which make the news about women in africa being raped, even to death, because a JUDGE orders it?

Then it is obviously not murder, as murder is not legal. This is simply another exception. Even america has the death penalty, which to some is "murder" (let us forget that it is in fact, not murder) as punishment. Punishment is not anything other than punishment. Killing is bad, but there are cases in which it is fine, and these are not really murder.

Quote

And lastly, prove that people who haven't performed actions such as murder and rape DON'T carry such genes. Because if we do carry such genes, then how can you know that when you're castrating a criminal that you're actually cleaning the gene-pool from when you're simply castrating people because they do things you don't like?

You cannot prove a negative. Great logic there. Aswell, I adressed this with the castration of the children of the murderer, as this would help ensure that you eradicate the genes, but it is unethical. If you are so willing to make sure, then that is what you would simply have to do.

And finally, if you castrate people who do things you do not like, you will help get rid of genes that cause that which you do not like. Let us say you do not like scientificaly "stupid" people. Through many generations, certainly you would have a decrease in the amount of those who are scientificaly "stupid" and an increase in those that are. You may end up having something bad happen too, like a decrease in artisticaly talented people or what have you, but you do not care because you helped get rid of a trait you do not like.

Quote

Prove that I don't carry a murder&rape gene. If I do, then even if I don't murder or rape anyone you're ideology says that I should be castrated. But if the whole world carries that gene, ie if it's a common gene which all humanity has, then your entire arguement is pointless because it's like saying that you should "castrate all males who have penises because it's the penises which allow them to rape".

Cannot prove a negative.

No, my ideology says that you should be castrated for doing the murder, and in doing so, you help clean the gene pool. You are simply being idiotic, bringing up idiotic things like this. It is unethical to punish those who have done nothing. Not only this, but I have already spoken of this! There can be other genes that can counteract such things, and thus if we were to get rid of the person, we would get rid of the good genes along with the bad. Not only that, but there are undoubtedly more than one gene that would cause such behaviour, and just because you have one does not do anything. It is safer to wait for it to manifest than it is to be stupid and go "snip, you have a penis!"

Logged  
kobok  
Veritas Council  
Tech Team  
Posts By Osmosis  
\*\*\*\*\*

Posts: 4766  
Karma: 150

Veritas Council

[View Profile](#)

Re: Eugenics

« Reply #34 on: November 08, 2005, 09:08:22 PM »

Quote from: LightLink on November 08, 2005, 05:24:48 PM

Quote

You declared that a man who kills a man for raping and killing his sister should be castrated. So what should we do with a man who castrates a man for raping and killing his sister? Because in case you haven't noticed, this is precisely what you're proposing, you're just trying to make "society" do it, rather than you personally doing it.

One should not take the law into their own hands. The government will do it, there is no need for you to do it yourself.

An action does not become moral simply because the government does it instead of the individual.

Quote from: LightLink on November 08, 2005, 05:24:48 PM

Quote

The best scientific evidence says that it's not likely, and that it won't significantly change the presence of such behavior. You, however, are basing your conclusion on assumptions which follow from the non-scientific myth of genetic predetermination.



You sure of that? I hear from most people that who we are is actually fairly split, 50/50, between genetics and upbringing. I have never heard anything in favor of upbringing completely.

The split between genetics and upbringing is only about 50/50 for simple and elementary attributes. If you want to talk about "intelligence" or "athletic endurance", then things such as this can be predicted about 50% by heredity and 50% by upbringing. If, however, you talk about complex attributes such as "ability to program in assembly language" or "tendency to brush ones teeth" or "tendency to strangle people to death in dark basements", then you are talking about specific complex behaviors which are mostly upbringing, and much less genetic.

At the very best, there are genetic tendencies such as "aggression" which are loosely correlated with crime, but aggression itself is not an unfavorable trait, since there are times when the aggressive members of a species are the ones responsible for the survival of that species. Eliminating this would be counterproductive, and would not necessarily reduce crime, but potentially make mankind more vulnerable to it.

Quote from: LightLink on November 08, 2005, 05:24:48 PM

Quote

If someone breaks into your house to steal your TV, is it okay for you to shoot him and then for you to turn around and shoot your wife, or run outside and also shoot the postal carrier? This is what you're saying is okay in war. Why is immoral behavior like this suddenly okay because you've decided to rename the same action "war"?

For example, this. I already spoke of this. This is one of the only ethical reasons for governmental punishment during war, when you attack your own side, which is what this hypothetical person is doing.

Was is war. It is different to do something in time of peace, than to do it in time of war.

It means nothing to say "war is war", it only means that you are making a special exemption without a reason.

You have just proposed the hypothesis that it is immoral to shoot a postal carrier near you, but that it is morally acceptable to go over to Iraq and shoot an innocent postal carrier or a random man's wife, simply because it is "war"? How is it more moral to shoot people with an address farther away from your own?

(And what's more, how does this difference derive from genetics, as you are proposing it does?)

Quote from: LightLink

You are simply being idiotic, bringing up idiotic things like this

This is your last warning, LightLink. You will not insult the debaters in the process of debating the topic, or you will be banned.

Logged

Want to learn psi? Check out our collection of psi articles.

SleepWalker

Pool Boy

Posts By Osmosis

\*\*\*\*\*

Posts: 588

Karma: 1

Pinkus Elephantus

[View Profile](#)

Re: Eugenics

« Reply #35 on: November 08, 2005, 11:26:21 PM »

Yes, definitely nominating yourself as the new Hitler.

Please continue to be insulting to people, as your way is the way correct?

Others must be inferior, they do not abide by your laws.

hail LL.

People don't generally feel it necessary to point out the flaws so precisely for the simple reason that it should be blatantly obvious to you.

If you don't understand the concepts of justice, virtue and vindictiveness it is not anyone else's fault but your own.

I would recommend you take a nice long hard look at yourself LL.

The thing that needs fixing most here is you.

Logged

How can you explain freedom, never having experienced it.

From the moment we are born we conform to the physical world. In narrow awareness of all that there is to perceive.

Try Tachyon[URL

solstice

Dreamwalker

Posts By Osmosis

\*\*\*\*\*

Posts: 2114

Karma: -5

"Receive and transmit..."

[View Profile](#)

Re: Eugenics

« Reply #36 on: November 09, 2005, 06:57:13 AM »

Quote from: Lightlink

Then it is obviously not murder, as murder is not legal. This is simply another exception. Even america has the death penalty, which to some is "murder" (let us forget that it is in fact, not murder) as punishment. Punishment is not anything other than punishment. Killing is bad, but there are cases in which it is fine, and these are not really murder. Lightlink, I want you to read this very carefully, okay? Dont question, until after you understood the meaning of the passage:

The unlawful and malicious, or premeditated killing of a human being by another...  
Taken from Webster's New World Dictionary, page 967, first definition.

What do you think Webster's is trying to say, in that passage?

According to that, ANY killing with intent is murder, regardless of the reason. This means calling something a punishment, does not negate it from being murder: there for, murder by the government or some jealous husband are the same thing.

Logged

Tell all the Truth but tell it slant: Success in Circuit lies. Too bright for our infirm Delight. The Truth's superb surprise. As Lightning to the Children eased, with explanation kind. The Truth must dazzle gradually, or every man be blind.

Tefeari: The Giant Impact Hypothesis is a theory

kobok

Veritas Council

Tech Team

Posts By Osmosis

\*\*\*\*\*

Posts: 4766

Karma: 150

[Veritas Council](#)

[View Profile](#)

Re: Eugenics

« Reply #37 on: November 09, 2005, 10:21:20 AM »

Quote from: solstice on November 09, 2005, 06:57:13 AM

Quote from: Lightlink

Then it is obviously not murder, as murder is not legal. This is simply another exception. Even america has the death penalty, which to some is "murder" (let us forget that it is in fact, not murder) as punishment. Punishment is not anything other than punishment. Killing is bad, but there are cases in which it is fine, and these are not really murder. Lightlink, I want you to read this very carefully, okay? Dont question, until after you understood the meaning of the passage:

The unlawful and malicious, or premeditated killing of a human being by another...  
Taken from Webster's New World Dictionary, page 967, first definition.

What do you think Webster's is trying to say, in that passage?

According to that, ANY killing with intent is murder, regardless of the reason. This means calling something a punishment, does not negate it from being murder: there for, murder by the government or some jealous husband are the same thing.

You missed "unlawful", which is an "out" for the first portion of the definition which lets people declare things like the holocaust "not-murder" simply by legalizing them. But lets not get sidetracked here. The point is not what a dictionary says, but whether or not the moral essence and effects of the action are the same.

« Last Edit: November 09, 2005, 10:24:29 AM by kobok »      Logged

Want to learn psi? Check out our collection of psi articles.

kakkarot

0. The Fool... Inverted?

Posts By Osmosis

\*\*\*\*\*

Posts: 2701

Karma: 3

Pirate "Not-A-Mod" BoB

[View Profile](#)

Re: Eugenics

« Reply #38 on: November 09, 2005, 10:28:12 AM »

"Then it is obviously not murder, as murder is not legal." So that's the difference between murder and not-murder? Well then, let's just rewrite the laws so that killing in general is completely legal and then you don't have to worry about your eugenics stuff. Or maybe we can instead make \*everything\* that we don't like illegal and then start killing everyone who has any sort of gene that we don't like, because it's legal.

Oh wait.. maybe.... just maybe.. murder refers to "consciously killing another human

being" rather than "the illegal killing of a human being". Oh, but of course you get around this by defining when murder is "allowed" and when it is not. Wow, great logic there.

<http://laws.justice.gc.ca/en/C-46/42644.html#section-229> Good thing America doesn't own the world Cheesy

And on the topic of logic: I said "And lastly, prove that people who haven't performed actions such as murder and rape DON'T carry such genes." To which you replied: "You cannot prove a negative. Great logic there." This is an incorrect use of the "cannot prove a negative" logic, as we CAN determine every single gene in a human being and therefore we can tell which genes a person does have and which they do not have. In retrospect, how do you propose that we absolutely \*know\* that someone has a murder or rape gene if we, according to your statement about not being able to know whether a person has a certain gene or not, cannot tell what genes they have or do not have?

Because, according to you, only the people with those genes should be castrated, so you have to be able to determine whether they have those genes or not. If they do, according to you they should be castrated. If they don't, according to you they can be left alone. Now, if you can determine through genetic testing that a person has said gene, then how is it that through genetic testing you cannot prove that a person doesn't have that gene? If you can prove they have it, and you can map the entire genome (which we can), then you can prove that another person doesn't have it.

So you copped out by finally going to the actions instead of the genetics. Well, guess what? We already punish the actions, and simply castrating one or two thousand people out of a few million who still carry the supposed gene but do not act upon it will not clean the gene pool. Once again, you don't seem to understand the unrealistic nature of what you're proposing.

~kakkarot

« Last Edit: November 09, 2005, 10:36:00 AM by kakkarot » Logged

Philippians 2:5 Your attitude should be the same as that of Christ Jesus: 6 Who, being in very nature God, did not consider equality with God something to be grasped, 7 but made himself nothing, taking the very nature of a servant, being made in human likeness.

solstice

Dreamwalker

Posts By Osmosis

\*\*\*\*\*

Posts: 2114

Karma: -5

"Receive and transmit..."

[View Profile](#)

Re: Eugenics

« Reply #39 on: November 09, 2005, 11:07:17 AM »

Quote

You missed "unlawful", which is an "out" for the first portion of the definition which lets people declare things like the holocaust "not-murder" simply by legalizing them. But lets not get sidetracked here. The point is not what a dictionary says, but whether or not the moral essence and effects of the action are the same.

No, I believe the entry was "unlawful and malicious OR premeditated.." Which means it can mean either concept. Why are you disagreeing with me? I am not the Nazi lol

« Last Edit: November 09, 2005, 11:16:57 AM by solstice » Logged

Tell all the Truth but tell it slant: Success in Circuit lies. Too bright for our infirm Delight. The Truth's superb surprise. As Lightning to the Children eased, with explanation kind. The Truth must dazzle gradually, or every man be blind.

Tefeari: The Giant Impact Hypothesis is a theory

LightLink

Has a lot of posts

Veritas Furniture

\*\*\*\*

Posts: 470

Karma: 0

[View Profile](#)

Re: Eugenics

« Reply #40 on: November 09, 2005, 03:33:12 PM »

Quote

An action does not become moral simply because the government does it instead of the individual.

And you are right. I never said it was really immoral for the person to take revenge, it is just, that is what the law is for. We have the death penalty, yet if you killed somebody who killed a family member, you go to jail because what you did was against the law, even if it is ethical.

Quote

The split between genetics and upbringing is only about 50/50 for simple and elementary attributes. If you want to talk about "intelligence" or "athletic endurance",

then things such as this can be predicted about 50% by heredity and 50% by upbringing. If, however, you talk about complex attributes such as "ability to program in assembly language" or "tendency to brush ones teeth" or "tendency to strangle people to death in dark basements", then you are talking about specific complex behaviors which are mostly upbringing, and much less genetic.

Ah I see, but you concede that it has at least a bit to do with genetics? Then just to get rid of that little bit, it is worth it.

Quote

At the very best, there are genetic tendencies such as "aggression" which are loosely correlated with crime, but aggression itself is not an unfavorable trait, since there are times when the aggressive members of a species are the ones responsible for the survival of that species. Eliminating this would be counterproductive, and would not necessarily reduce crime, but potentially make mankind more vulnerable to it.

Aggression is not the only thing that causes crime. Stupidity is a big one, whether due to bad upbringing or...they are just stupid. As well as a few other things. Aggressive people can still lead productive criminal free lives.

Quote

It means nothing to say "war is war", it only means that you are making a special exemption without a reason.

The reason is that war is war! You are trying to kill them there! You are trying to win.

Quote

You have just proposed the hypothesis that it is immoral to shoot a postal carrier near you, but that it is morally acceptable to go over to Iraq and shoot an innocent postal carrier or a random man's wife, simply because it is "war"? How is it more moral to shoot people with an address farther away from your own?

War happens. When you are at war you wish to win the war, and a part of war is partaking in the spoils, things like rape and pillaging, and looting. When in war, this stuff happens, and because you are in a war, it is justified. It is not pretty, but it is reality.

Quote

And what's more, how does this difference derive from genetics, as you are proposing it does?

It does not. It is simply okay during war.

Quote

This is your last warning, LightLink. You will not insult the debaters in the process of debating the topic, or you will be banned.

There is a difference between acting idiotic, and being an idiot, having idiotic responses, and being an idiot.

Why do you not make good arguments here, as you did in chat? Sure, some of this is fine, but hypothetical situations being proposed left and right does nothing.

Quote

Yes, definitely nominating yourself as the new Hitler.

Please continue to be insulting to people, as your way is the way correct?

Others must be inferior, they do not abide by your laws.

Lol. It is sad, that this is true(minus the hitler part). Although I do try to not insult people but sometimes it is such a slap in the face for people to not read, or to have crazy ideas.

Quote

hail LL.

W00t.

Quote

People don't generally feel it necessary to point out the flaws so precisely for the simple reason that it should be blatantly obvious to you.

The problem is, is there are some flaws, but that is just because not everything is perfect. These people are not pointing out the flaws, so much as bringing up hypothetical questions to determine the ethics of something. Why do they not go against the death penalty for such things? Atleast with this, you get to live! I do not propose "the perfect system" nearly a better one. And pointing out that everything is not always peachy and flowery with fluffy kittens is not doing anything productive.

Quote

If you don't understand the concepts of justice, virtue and vindictiveness it is not anyone else's fault but your own.

I think it is you who do not understand these concepts.

Quote

The thing that needs fixing most here is you.

Nice one.

Quote

"Then it is obviously not murder, as murder is not legal." So that's the difference



between murder and not-murder?

Duh. Murder is illegal killing. Or did you not know that?

Quote

Well then, let's just rewrite the laws so that killing in general is completely legal and then you don't have to worry about your eugenics stuff. Or maybe we can instead make \*everything\* that we don't like illegal and then start killing everyone who has any sort of gene that we don't like, because it's legal.

This is what I mean. Of course everything we do not like is illegal, that is why it is illegal! We do not like murder, rape, stealing, cheating, abuse, molestation, ect. so we make them illegal! What do you think the purpose of laws are? And we need punishment, and castration is better than death.

Quote

Oh wait.. maybe.... just maybe.. murder refers to "consciously killing another human being" rather than "the illegal killing of a human being". Oh, but of course you get around this by defining when murder is "allowed" and when it is not. Wow, great logic there.

No, murder is illegal. It does not matter if it is conscious or not. All murder is killing, not all killing is murder. Understand that.

Quote

And on the topic of logic: I said "And lastly, prove that people who haven't performed actions such as murder and rape DON'T carry such genes." To which you replied: "You cannot prove a negative. Great logic there." This is an incorrect use of the "cannot prove a negative" logic, as we CAN determine every single gene in a human being and therefore we can tell which genes a person does have and which they do not have.

Not yet we can't. It would take years to sequence the entire DNA of a person. Just one. And there are undoubtedly many many things that contribute to such crime. And we do not even know what they are either! So in fact, no, we can not prove this negative.

Quote

In retrospect, how do you propose that we absolutely \*know\* that someone has a murder or rape gene if we, according to your statement about not being able to know whether a person has a certain gene or not, cannot tell what genes they have or do not have?

They murder and rape. Duh.

Quote

Because, according to you, only the people with those genes should be castrated, so

you have to be able to determine whether they have those genes or not. If they do, according to you they should be castrated. If they don't, according to you they can be left alone.

I never said anything like this. I will stop replying to you if you keep this up. I said, people who do such crimes should be castrated. I actively went against what you just said twice now. We should do something, when they do something. We do not know for certain that just because they have it, they will do it.

So, not if they have the genes! Only if they do it! Understand?

Quote

Now, if you can determine through genetic testing that a person has said gene, then how is it that through genetic testing you cannot prove that a person doesn't have that gene? If you can prove they have it, and you can map the entire genome (which we can), then you can prove that another person doesn't have it.

We have mapped the entire genome, but we have not a clue what they all do, and we are not about to do it all again. Sequencing every single strand takes time. Thus, we can not prove that they have it, nor that they do not, the point is, is that they committed a bad crime, should be punished, genes contributed to the crime even if in a small way, so we can kill two birds with one stone.

Quote

So you copped out by finally going to the actions instead of the genetics. Well, guess what? We already punish the actions, and simply castrating one or two thousand people out of a few million who still carry the supposed gene but do not act upon it will not clean the gene pool. Once again, you don't seem to understand the unrealistic nature of what you're proposing.

I spoke of this too. Twice now. I said it was unethical to really purge the genepool. The way we could \*really\* do it would be to say, castrate anybody who is directly related to the convict. Parents, siblings, children. That would make sure. It would get cleaned out that way. Is it ethical? They have done nothing, so no.

What I say, is that this helps. More so than doing nothing at all.

Quote

No, I believe the entry was "unlawful and malicious OR premeditated.." Which means it can mean either concept. Why are you disagreeing with me? I am not the Nazi lol

Did I not call you a Nazi in chat just yesterday, and you took offence? And here you are doing it to me. Good thing I do not care. What I do care about though is the double standard. Either change the rules, or obey them. Or do not obey them and just do not bother me.

Now, ontopic, this is wrong. Murder is a legal defignition, it has to be against the law to be considered "murder." If you wish to be generic, the word "killing" does exist.

But like Kobok said, it is the ethics of it, which I responded too. It is equally ethical regardless of who did it, but we have laws to keep people from taking things into their own hands.

« Last Edit: November 09, 2005, 04:54:11 PM by LightLink » Logged

kakkarot

0. The Fool... Inverted?

Posts By Osmosis

\*\*\*\*\*

Posts: 2701

Karma: 3

Pirate "Not-A-Mod" BoB

[View Profile](#)

Re: Eugenics

« Reply #41 on: November 09, 2005, 03:56:10 PM »

HOLY FUCK, how do you do this without realizing it?

First you said: "Not yet we can't. It would take years to sequence the entire DNA of a person. Just one."

And \*then\* you said: "We have mapped the entire genome"

You don't understand anything you're saying, do you?

"Of course everything we do not like is elligal, that is why it is elligal!" Not quite. Things that are detrimental to a person's health become illegal, unless the majority of the people demand it remain legal (ie, cigarettes and alcohol). Little kids are annoying brats and I don't like them, but even if the majority of the people didn't like them they wouldn't become illegal just because people don't like them. There's a huge difference.

And even if you go the route of "legal killing" versus "illegal killing" there's NO FUCKING WAY that your genes can tell the difference between killing that's legal and killing that's illegal. So the cop who kills has the same genes, according to you, as the killer who gets shot (and dies) by the cop. Brilliant. Abso-fucking-lutely brilliant. So now you have to castrate the cop because he's got the killing gene.

I think it's I who will stop replying to you now.

~kakkarot

Logged

Philippians 2:5 Your attitude should be the same as that of Christ Jesus: 6 Who, being in very nature God, did not consider equality with God something to be grasped, 7 but made himself nothing, taking the very nature of a servant, being made in human likeness.

LightLink

Has a lot of posts

Veritas Furniture

\*\*\*\*

Posts: 470

Karma: 0

[View Profile](#)

Re: Eugenics

« Reply #42 on: November 09, 2005, 05:02:31 PM »

Quote

First you said: "Not yet we can't. It would take years to sequence the entire DNA of a person. Just one."

And \*then\* you said: "We have mapped the entire genome"

After this, I refuse to talk to you any longer.

We did it. It took us what, 10 years? What did I say? "It would take years to...." That is for one person. We would have to do it all over again to somebody to see if they personally have something. And that is assuming we know what every single little code does, which we do not.

Quote

Things that are detrimental to a person's health become illegal, unless the majority of the people demand it remain legal (ie, cigarettes and alcohol).

We as a people do not like people hurting themselves, so it is illegal. But if that changes, it might be legal. As in, if they suddenly like it. You just proved me.

Quote

Little kids are annoying brats and I don't like them, but even if the majority of the people didn't like them they wouldn't become illegal just because people don't like them. There's a huge difference.

That would be because even if the majority of people did not like children, they would

aslo not like dying as a species.

Quote

So the cop who kills has the same genes, according to you, as the killer who gets shot (and dies) by the cop. Brilliant. Abso-fucking-lutely brilliant. So now you have to castrate the cop because he's got the killing gene.

Not certainly. But let us assume they do have similar enough genes that they meet what you are saying.

- 1 - The reason the killer did it is much much different then the cop. The cop did it out of self defence. (a cop cannot kill the killer any other way and it be legal)
- 2 - The killer was most defignitely not feeling fearfull for his life when the killing took place. (Assuming an actual malicious murder anyway)

Quote

I think it's I who will stop replying to you now.

Thank you.

Logged  
kobok  
Veritas Council  
Tech Team  
Posts By Osmosis  
\*\*\*\*\*  
Posts: 4766  
Karma: 150

Veritas Council

[View Profile](#)

Re: Eugenics

« Reply #43 on: November 09, 2005, 05:53:29 PM »

Quote from: LightLink on November 09, 2005, 03:33:12 PM

Quote

The split between genetics and upbringing is only about 50/50 for simple and

elementary attributes. If you want to talk about "intelligence" or "athletic endurance", then things such as this can be predicted about 50% by heredity and 50% by upbringing. If, however, you talk about complex attributes such as "ability to program in assembly language" or "tendency to brush ones teeth" or "tendency to strangle people to death in dark basements", then you are talking about specific complex behaviors which are mostly upbringing, and much less genetic.

Ah I see, but you concede that it has at least a bit to do with genetics? Then just to get rid of that little bit, it is worth it.

You say "just to get rid of that little bit, it is worth it", as if an insignificantly small correlation between criminal behavior and genetic tendencies toward aggression is worth CASTRATING PEOPLE? Do you think there is no detriment to society, or to the members of society, if it starts castrating people?

Quote from: LightLink on November 09, 2005, 03:33:12 PM

Quote

It means nothing to say "war is war", it only means that you are making a special exemption without a reason.

The reason is that war is war! You are trying to kill them there! You are trying to win.

Quote

You have just proposed the hypothesis that it is immoral to shoot a postal carrier near you, but that it is morally acceptable to go over to Iraq and shoot an innocent postal carrier or a random man's wife, simply because it is "war"? How is it more moral to shoot people with an address farther away from your own?

War happens. When you are at war you wish to win the war, and a part of war is partaking in the spoils, things like rape and pillaging, and looting. When in war, this stuff happens, and because you are in a war, it is justified. It is not pretty, but it is reality.

"The reason is that crime is crime! You are trying to commit crime! You are trying to get stuff and feel better!

Crime happens. When you are committing crime, you wish to get stuff and hurt people, and a part of crime is partaking in the spoils, things like rape and pillaging, and looting. When committing crime, this stuff happens, and because you are committing crime, it is justified. It is not pretty, but it is reality."

Gee, the above sounds pretty ridiculous when I put the word "crime" in there, now doesn't it. But it sounds equally ridiculous with the word "war" in there. You can't justify immoral behavior by just saying, "That's what people want to do."

Quote from: LightLink on November 09, 2005, 03:33:12 PM

And we need punishment, and castration is better than death.

Lifetime incarceration is more moral, cheaper, and more fool-proof against false-convictions than either of the above options.

Quote from: LightLink on November 09, 2005, 03:33:12 PM

Quote

In retrospect, how do you propose that we absolutely \*know\* that someone has a murder or rape gene if we, according to your statement about not being able to know whether a person has a certain gene or not, cannot tell what genes they have or do not have?

They murder and rape. Duh.

Do you know what percentage of people who commit murder also had a parent who committed murder? Seriously, find a percentage. I'd also like to hear what your personal estimate for this is.

Would it surprise you to learn that single-parent families and unemployment are usually the largest predictors of violent crime, and not a parental history of violent crime? These are environmental factors, and this demonstrates quite convincingly that most violent crime is not hereditary. In comparison, you have still not demonstrated that it is.

Quote from: LightLink on November 09, 2005, 03:33:12 PM

What I say, is that this helps. Moreso than doing nothing at all.

But at the cost to society of opening the doors to cruel and unusual punishment. Surgically altering people against their will, and removing people's body parts against their will, are not things a civilized society should engage in. This does not provide any significant contribution toward preventing future offenses, but is instead cruelly punitive.

Logged

Want to learn psi? Check out our collection of psi articles.

LightLink

Has a lot of posts

Veritas Furniture

\*\*\*\*

Posts: 470

Karma: 0

[View Profile](#)

Re: Eugenics

« Reply #44 on: November 09, 2005, 06:29:06 PM »

Quote

You say "just to get rid of that little bit, it is worth it", as if an insignificantly small correlation between criminal behavior and genetic tendencies toward aggression is worth CASTRATING PEOPLE? Do you think there is no detriment to society, or to the members of society, if it starts castrating people?

You make castration out to be such a horrible thing in response for rape and murder. But oh, it seems lifetime imprisonment, where you can not do much of anything you wish, and killing, is perfectly justified. How so?

I see no problem with castration. It is no more detrimental than society imprisoning and killing people.

Quote

Gee, the above sounds pretty ridiculous when I put the word "crime" in there, now doesn't it. But it sounds equally ridiculous with the word "war" in there. You can't justify immoral behavior by just saying, "That's what people want to do."

I am only trying to justify not punishing people for war. War is fairly unethical, just like crime. But it is insane to suggest punishing your soldiers! Or to just...not protect yourself or something. War happens. Crime happens. Both are unethical, but you cannot punish people for war, if they are your own people.

Quote

Lifetime incarceration is more moral, cheaper, and more fool-proof against false-convictions than either of the above options.

I do not agree at all. I think lifetime incarceration is fairly unethical. I can not do a darn thing I want. I have to get raped by greasy people in showers. I have to be told when to eat, sleep, and use the restroom. I have no freedom at all. And it is for the rest of my life. It is worse than death.

The citizens pay for constant room and board for criminals. They get free shelter and food for the rest of their life. That is expensive.

How is it more foolproof? You get tried before a punishment is carried out! In both situations, you get tried, get convicted, and then something different happens. Permanent incarceration and castration offer no difference in freedom against false-convictions.

Quote

Do you know what percentage of people who commit murder also had a parent who committed murder? Seriously, find a percentage. I'd also like to hear what your personal estimate for this is.

It is probably close to zero. It does not make sense for people to commit murder to have



parents that do it aswell.

Quote

Would it surprise you to learn that single-parent families and unemployment are usually the largest predictors of violent crime, and not a parental history of violent crime? These are environmental factors, and this demonstrates quite convincingly that most violent crime is not hereditary. In comparison, you have still not demonstrated that it is.

No, I would not be surprised it makes sense. Given that some people cannot think enough to figure out how to get out of such a situation, and are so pathetic that they get all sad and angry from having one parent.

In comparison, would it not be an interesting hypothesis to say that the difference between the people who are unemployed/have a single-parent family and commit murder, and the ones who are unemployed/have a single-parent family and do not commit murder is a genetic one? Of course, counting in other environmental factors. But even then, the ones who have everything in common with a killer, but did not kill, most likely have a genetic difference.

Quote

But at the cost to society of opening the doors to cruel and unusual punishment. Surgically altering people against their will, and removing people's body parts against their will, are not things a civilized society should engage in. This does not provide any significant contribution toward preventing future offenses, but is instead cruelly punitive.

And what in the world does incarcerating people against their will, or killing them against their will, or taking their money, or putting them in an asylum, do? Does it give a significant contribution? No, we do not even try to rehabilitate most criminals. And if you are sick in the head, you are sick in the head. It is not common to be "fixed" from such things. Is it cruel and unusual? Just as much as castration. At least with castration, I can still live, and do what I want after I get out of "prison." (as lifetime incarceration is unethical)

And how does any of the things we do not prevent future offences? Atleast castration would get rid of tons of testosterone, which will change their their chemistry and make them more passive.

Logged

Pages: 1 2 [3] 4 5 ... 9      Print

« previous next »

Jump to:

=> Main Hall

<http://forums.vrsociety.net/index.php/topic%2C6825.45.html>

1 capture

23 Jun 2013

May JUN Jul

23

2012 2013 2014

About this capture

The Veritas Society

\*

\*HomeForumsChatHelpSearchRetroLoginRegister

Welcome, Guest. Please login or register.

Did you miss your activation email?

June 23, 2013, 03:13:24 PM

Forever

Login with username, password and session length

Search:

Advanced search

209063 Posts in 14846 Topics by 18583 Members - Latest Member: - jayfk Most  
online today: 104 - most online ever: 430 (June 28, 2007, 02:58:51 PM)

+ The Veritas Society

|-+ The Auditorium

| |-+ Main Hall

|| |-+ Eugenics 0 Members and 1 Guest are viewing this topic. « previous next »

Pages: 1 2 3 [4] 5 6 ... 9 Print

Author Topic: Eugenics (Read 11078 times)

kakkarot

0. The Fool... Inverted?

Posts By Osmosis

\*\*\*\*\*

Posts: 2701

Karma: 3

Pirate "Not-A-Mod" BoB

View Profile

Re: Eugenics

« Reply #45 on: November 09, 2005, 07:20:20 PM »

The entire idea of genetics causing people to murder and rape is ridiculous in the first place. Genes define the physical characteristics of the body and do not control actions. Actions are a result of brain processes, not genetics. Genetics determine your eye colour, your hair colour, your height, your metabolism, etc. Your brain determines if you kill someone, or rape someone, or steal something. Way different set of parameters.

The idea of genetics causing people to perform actions is based upon a simplification of the entire field of genetics.

Did I say I wouldn't reply? What? I'm evil. I lied.

~kakkarot

Logged

Philippians 2:5 Your attitude should be the same as that of Christ Jesus: 6 Who, being in very nature God, did not consider equality with God something to be grasped, 7 but made himself nothing, taking the very nature of a servant, being made in human likeness.

Nereus

Kher Heb

Veritas Furniture

\*\*\*\*

Posts: 363

Karma: 4

Step I

[View Profile WWW](#)

Re: Eugenics

« Reply #46 on: November 09, 2005, 09:14:43 PM »

I don't even have the volition to read through most of this, but.

Kak summed it up well enough--genetics serves its own function, the brain dictates action.

Why? I'll provide a few, simple examples.

I'm descended from more "mob" family than I care to count; yay for being Italian.

I think they'd fall into the "violent crime" category. Yet I've never even been into a fist-fight. Has the opportunity presented itself? Many times.

But I've always chosen not to risk my hide over something so stupid.

Genetic damage won't suddenly morph you into a rabid killing machine.  
But severe trauma to the brain can cause serious and extreme changes in personality, ability to make choices, etc.

The problem with the world isn't criminals passing on their "seed". It's gross generalizations based off a complete lack of accurate information.  
God bless propoganda.

Logged

Sometimes my shadow leads, or it follows me, but we never seem to become one and the same.

kobok

Veritas Council

Tech Team

Posts By Osmosis

\*\*\*\*\*

Posts: 4766

Karma: 150

Veritas Council

[View Profile](#)

Re: Eugenics

« Reply #47 on: November 10, 2005, 01:52:05 AM »

Quote from: LightLink on November 09, 2005, 06:29:06 PM

Quote

Gee, the above sounds pretty ridiculous when I put the word "crime" in there, now doesn't it. But it sounds equally ridiculous with the word "war" in there. You can't justify immoral behavior by just saying, "That's what people want to do."

I am only trying to justify not punishing people for war. War is fairly unethical, just like crime. But it is insane to suggest punishing your soldiers! Or to just...not protect yourself or something. War happens. Crime happens. Both are unethical, but you cannot punish people for war, if they are your own people.

Yes we damn well can punish our own people for doing something wrong in the midst of war. We would be foolish not to. Do you know why the insurgents in Iraq were dressing up westerners in orange jumpsuits and torturing them? It was in direct retaliation for our torture of Iraqi citizens and other Arabs who we had dressed up in orange jumpsuits. When our own people violate the rules of war in an immoral and criminal way, then innocent people on both sides of the conflict are hurt. We not only

CAN punish them, but we have a moral obligation to do so. It will be a long time before everything is said and done in response to those events.

Quote from: LightLink on November 09, 2005, 06:29:06 PM

And how does any of the things we do not prevent future offences? Atleast castration would get rid of tons of testosterone, which will change their their chemistry and make them more passive.

And give them cancer. Perhaps you forgot to look up the side-effects of the testosterone loss.

Quote from: LightLink on November 09, 2005, 06:29:06 PM

Quote

Lifetime incarceration is more moral, cheaper, and more fool-proof against false-convictions than either of the above options.

I do not agree at all. I think lifetime incarceration is fairly unethical. I can not do a darn thing I want. I have to get raped by greasy people in showers. I have to be told when to eat, sleep, and use the restroom. I have no freedom at all. And it is for the rest of my life. It is worse than death.

The citizens pay for constant room and board for criminals. They get free shelter and food for the rest of their life. That is expensive.

How is it more foolproof? You get tried before a punishment is carried out! In both situations, you get tried, get convicted, and then something different happens. Permanent incarceration and castration offer no difference in freedom against false-convictions.

You should study the legal process more carefully. Innocent people are convicted and then have those convictions overturned on a regular basis. This is actually fairly common in rape and murder cases, since with emotions running so high, rational thought is at a minimum. There have even been a significant number of people put to death in the U.S. and then later found innocent. (Oops.) Permanent incarceration for the most serious offenses is the ONLY punishment which simultaneously serves as a punishment for the guilty, an isolation to protect the innocent, and yields all the time possible for the innocent to prepare a better defense and appeal their conviction.

And if you bother to look up the numbers, lifetime imprisonment is actually cheaper. The legal fees to process all the appeals and procedural requirements to try to make sure someone is actually guilty in a death penalty case exceed those of a lifetime imprisonment sentence by so much that they actually exceed the cost of housing the inmate for the rest of his or her natural life.

Quote from: LightLink on November 09, 2005, 06:29:06 PM

Quote

Do you know what percentage of people who commit murder also had a parent who committed murder? Seriously, find a percentage. I'd also like to hear what your personal estimate for this is.

It is probably close to zero. It does not make sense for people to commit murder to have parents that do it aswell.

Well then lets use a tiny bit of elementary logic here. If almost 0% of the people who commit murder have parents who do as well, then by elementary logic, almost 0% of the people who commit murder have children who do as well. And therefore, your entire proposal is without merit.

Logged

Want to learn psi? Check out our collection of psi articles.

LightLink

Has a lot of posts

Veritas Furniture

\*\*\*\*

Posts: 470

Karma: 0

[View Profile](#)

Re: Eugenics

« Reply #48 on: November 10, 2005, 04:50:14 AM »

Quote

Yes we damn well can punish our own people for doing something wrong in the midst of war. We would be foolish not to. Do you know why the insurgents in Iraq were dressing up westerners in orange jumpsuits and torturing them? It was in direct retaliation for our torture of Iraqi citizens and other Arabs who we had dressed up in orange jumpsuits. When our own people violate the rules of war in an immoral and criminal way, then innocent people on both sides of the conflict are hurt. We not only CAN punish them, but we have a moral obligation to do so. It will be a long time before everything is said and done in response to those events.

Fine. You are right.

Quote

And give them cancer. Perhaps you forgot to look up the side-effects of the testosterone loss.

I looked it up a bit, on wikipedia. Never heard of cancer...ever. How would one get cancer from testosterone loss?

Quote

You should study the legal process more carefully. Innocent people are convicted and then have those convictions overturned on a regular basis. This is actually fairly common in rape and murder cases, since with emotions running so high, rational thought is at a minimum. There have even been a significant number of people put to death in the U.S. and then later found innocent. (Oops.) Permanent incarceration for the most serious offenses is the ONLY punishment which simultaneously serves as a punishment for the guilty, an isolation to protect the innocent, and yields all the time possible for the innocent to prepare a better defense and appeal their conviction.

Irrelevant. You say that many are put to death and then later found innocent. I knew this already, but you said it. If it happens now, nobody cares about it now (nobody with enough power, or not enough people with power), then what is the problem with castration and later found to be innocent? At least you get to live. And besides, I try to prevent that.

Quote

And if you bother to look up the numbers, lifetime imprisonment is actually cheaper. The legal fees to process all the appeals and procedural requirements to try to make sure someone is actually guilty in a death penalty case exceed those of a lifetime imprisonment sentence by so much that they actually exceed the cost of housing the inmate for the rest of his or her natural life.

I would not be surprised. But does that mean that lifetime imprisonment is cheap? No. Simply it is cheaper than something else. A million dollar house is still cheaper than a billion dollar one, but the million dollar one is still expensive.

Quote

Well then let's use a tiny bit of elementary logic here. If almost 0% of the people who commit murder have parents who do as well, then by elementary logic, almost 0% of the people who commit murder have children who do as well. And therefore, your entire proposal is without merit.

Genetics is complicated. Not only are there other reasons that murderers do not have children who murder, but the child may not have inherited the correct genes to be stupid enough to murder. Do we track the descendants of murderers, in order to make sure that none of them commit a horrible crime, ever?

Logged  
solstice  
Dreamwalker  
Posts By Osmosis  
\*\*\*\*\*

Posts: 2114  
Karma: -5

"Receive and transmit..."

[View Profile](#)

Re: Eugenics

« Reply #49 on: November 10, 2005, 05:41:59 AM »

Quote

Surgically altering people against their will, and removing people's body parts against their will, are not things a civilized society should engage in.

We already do that. In fact it is considered culturally acceptable and religiously important. We call it circumcision. It's not less barbaric, but there you have it.

Lightlink, there is a significant link between estrogen and cancer, that you failed to take into consideration. The risk of cancer increases with the loss of testosterone, which is why females are more likely to get cancer; and older men are more likely to, as well as heart disease.

Instead of assuming you are a physician, actually take out some books on the subject, or ask someone with a degree.

PS - how do you propose to deal with women to commit sexual assault?

« Last Edit: November 10, 2005, 06:00:31 AM by solstice »    Logged

Tell all the Truth but tell it slant: Success in Circuit lies. Too bright for our infirm Delight. The Truth's superb surprise. As Lightning to the Children eased, with explanation kind. The Truth must dazzle gradually, or every man be blind.

Tefeari: The Giant Impact Hypothesis is a theory

Faijer

Existential Pragmatist

Veritas Moderator

Posts By Osmosis

\*\*\*\*\*

Posts: 3201  
Karma: 41

The Devil's Advocate



[View Profile WWW](#)

Re: Eugenics

« Reply #50 on: November 10, 2005, 09:28:32 AM »

Quote from: LightLink

I looked it up a bit, on wikipedia. Never heard of cancer...ever. How would one get cancer from testosterone loss?

Testicular cancer? Abnormally high levels of oestrogen compared to testosterone, either through testosterone loss or oestrogen increase, or both, can lead to testicular cancer. Have you never watched Fight Club? (in Fight Club's case, Bob had much higher levels of testosterone and his body responded by upping the oestrogen, which had the same end result).

Logged

My WordPress Blog is updated regularly.

NEW UPDATE: Life begins at conception: A thought experiment (29/08/2012)

kobok

Veritas Council

Tech Team

Posts By Osmosis

\*\*\*\*\*

Posts: 4766

Karma: 150

Veritas Council

[View Profile](#)

Re: Eugenics

« Reply #51 on: November 10, 2005, 10:44:15 AM »

Quote from: LightLink on November 10, 2005, 04:50:14 AM

Quote

And give them cancer. Perhaps you forgot to look up the side-effects of the testosterone loss.

I looked it up a bit, on wikipedia. Never heard of cancer...ever. How would one get cancer from testosterone loss?

Wikipedia is a bit barren at times. Try googling around. There have been studies linking low testosterone levels in men to prostate cancer, to Leukemia, and likely to an assortment of other cancers. Women have an assortment of comparable problems with estrogen levels and cancer.

Quote from: LightLink on November 10, 2005, 04:50:14 AM

Irrelevant. You say that many are put to death and then later found innocent. I knew this already, but you said it. If it happens now, nobody cares about it now (nobody with enough power, or not enough people with power), then what is the problem with castration and later found to be innocent? At least you get to live. And besides, I try to prevent that.

Yeah, I'm sure when you're innocent and somebody cuts off your nuts for it, the fact that somebody wanted to prevent wrongful convictions will be very comforting to you.

As for "nobody with power cares", you should read the news:

<http://www.cnn.com/2003/LAW/01/11/illinois.death.row/>

Perhaps not enough people with power care enough, sure, that's usually a problem. But people are certainly and genuinely concerned about this problem from both political parties.

Quote from: LightLink on November 10, 2005, 04:50:14 AM

Quote

And if you bother to look up the numbers, lifetime imprisonment is actually cheaper. The legal fees to process all the appeals and procedural requirements to try to make sure someone is actually guilty in a death penalty case exceed those of a lifetime imprisonment sentence by so much that they actually exceed the cost of housing the inmate for the rest of his or her natural life.

I would not be surprised. But does that mean that lifetime imprisonment is cheap? No. Simply it is cheaper than something else. A million dollar house is still cheaper than a billion dollar one, but the million dollar one is still expensive.

Castration is not a solution to REPLACE lifetime imprisonment. Imprisonment is used for much more than just a punishment, it also isolates the guilty from future victims. Castrating people and releasing them would be a terrible idea in comparison. So saying it "costs some money" is not a relevant argument. Yes, it costs some money to keep people in prison, and that expense is necessary to achieve maximal justice.

Quote from: LightLink on November 10, 2005, 04:50:14 AM

Quote

Well then let's use a tiny bit of elementary logic here. If almost 0% of the people who commit murder have parents who do as well, then by elementary logic, almost 0% of the people who commit murder have children who do as well. And therefore, your entire proposal is without merit.

Genetics is complicated. Not only are there other reasons that murderers do not have children who murder, but the child may not have inherited the correct genes to be stupid enough to murder. Do we track the descendants of murderers, in order to make

sure that none of them commit a horrible crime, ever?

You tell me. You're the one who proposed that genetics is relevant here, despite the mass of people and evidence arguing against you. Then you yourself even admitted that there's almost no hereditary correlation between parent and child for murder.

Logged

Want to learn psi? Check out our collection of psi articles.

LightLink

Has a lot of posts

Veritas Furniture

\*\*\*\*

Posts: 470

Karma: 0

View Profile

Re: Eugenics

« Reply #52 on: November 10, 2005, 04:20:13 PM »

Quote

PS - how do you propose to deal with women to commit sexual assault?

This is why I tried to keep using the term "fix."

Quote

Wikipedia is a bit barren at times. Try googling around. There have been studies linking low testosterone levels in men to prostate cancer, to Leukemia, and likely to an assortment of other cancers. Women have an assortment of comparable problems with estrogen levels and cancer.

I see. How low are we speaking? We *could* give them pills to prevent this. But that would ruin the pluss of sedating them.

Quote

Yeah, I'm sure when you're innocent and somebody cuts off your nuts for it, the fact that somebody wanted to prevent wrongful convictions will be very comforting to you.

As for "nobody with power cares", you should read the news:

<http://www.cnn.com/2003/LAW/01/11/illinois.death.row/>

Perhaps not enough people with power care enough, sure, that's usually a problem. But people are certainly and genuinely concerned about this problem from both political

parties.

I said "or." It is either nobody with power, or not enough people with power. I said this. Also, if I am innocent and will be killed tomorrow, I sure as hell would be more angry than just losing the ability to reproduce. Besides, I have another thread going on proposing a solution to this "false conviction" problem.

Quote

Castration is not a solution to REPLACE lifetime imprisonment. Imprisonment is used for much more than just a punishment, it also isolates the guilty from future victims. Castrating people and releasing them would be a terrible idea in comparison. So saying it "costs some money" is not a relevant argument. Yes, it costs some money to keep people in prison, and that expense is necessary to achieve maximal justice.

Never said it would replace it. But lifetime imprisonment is dumb. You should only stay for a few years, as a slave to the state, so you can work for your room and board. That way you are not a useless leech to society, and it makes up for the money spent on you. And finally, you get released, and you can do as you please later. Unlike lifetime imprisonment which means you have no rights for the rest of your life.

Quote

You tell me. You're the one who proposed that genetics is relevant here, despite the mass of people and evidence arguing against you. Then you yourself even admitted that there's almost no hereditary correlation between parent and child for murder.

I doubt it. I have no idea. I was actually asking. If we do not constantly keep track, it would be very difficult to prove either way. However, genetics has a hand in everything. Surely, if even a little, it has a hand in criminal acts, and that is justification enough.

And I think it has less to do with "genetics has nothing to do with it" and more to do with "they did not get the right combination of genes."

Logged  
solstice  
Dreamwalker  
Posts By Osmosis  
\*\*\*\*\*

Posts: 2114  
Karma: -5

"Receive and transmit..."

[View Profile](#)

Re: Eugenics

« Reply #53 on: November 10, 2005, 05:38:45 PM »

Lightlink, are you enjoying all this?

Quote

Unlike lifetime imprisonment which means you have no rights for the rest of your life. I think you need to get a little perspective on reality. Prisoners have lots of rights, which sometimes outweighs that of their victims - the law takes great measures to insure the safety of those prosecuted.. This is especially true in cases of domestic violence and sexual assault on a minor.

On a more fundamental note, try looking into the first thing you learn in US History and Government: The Constitution. Several amendments promise rights of those accused and prosecuted, including the right to a FAIR trial and the right to be present during their prosecution.

Then, we have the MIRANDA RIGHTS which include the right to legal representation. During incarceration, an appointed lawyer may continue to work for that person.

If I were you, I would also get to know some people who actually work in a prison, instead of making guesses at what you think happens. Prisoners get a lot of privileges that taxes pay for, which includes regular meals and cable television.

Logged

Tell all the Truth but tell it slant: Success in Circuit lies. Too bright for our infirm Delight. The Truth's superb surprise. As Lightning to the Children eased, with explanation kind. The Truth must dazzle gradually, or every man be blind.

Tefeari: The Giant Impact Hypothesis is a theory

ShiningDragon

Regular Member

A Familiar Feature

\*\*\*

Posts: 205

Karma: 0

Regular Member

[View Profile](#)

Re: Eugenics

« Reply #54 on: November 10, 2005, 06:35:29 PM »

Needless to say, but if everyone were kept in prison and we implemented all the things you have noted link it would raise taxes skyhigh. Everytime a prisoner goes to the

bathroom we are paying the bill and I still don't believe that genetics have anything to do with a person's behavior. I know that certain characteristics of genetics like that they way people cross their legs is genetic, and how they sleep, but I don't think this carries much further than that. Also a lot of the ideas you suggested were on the lines of cruel and unusual I'd say like castrating people. Definitely don't agree with that one.

Logged

"The church says that the Earth is flat, but I know that it is round. For I have seen the shadow on the moon and I have more faith in the Shadow than in the Church." - Ferdinand Magellan

And you shall cry tears of crimson...

LightLink

Has a lot of posts

Veritas Furniture

\*\*\*\*

Posts: 470

Karma: 0

[View Profile](#)

Re: Eugenics

« Reply #55 on: November 10, 2005, 07:49:37 PM »

Quote

I think you need to get a little perspective on reality. Prisoners have lots of rights, which sometimes outweighs that of their victims - the law takes great measures to insure the safety of those prosecuted.. This is especially true in cases of domestic violence and sexual assault on a minor.

On a more fundamental note, try looking into the first thing you learn in US History and Government: The Constitution. Several amendments promise rights of those accused and prosecuted, including the right to a FAIR trial and the right to be present during their prosecution.

Then, we have the MIRANDA RIGHTS which include the right to legal representation. During incarceration, an appointed lawyer may continue to work for that person.

If I were you, I would also get to know some people who actually work in a prison, instead of making guesses at what you think happens. Prisoners get a lot of privileges that taxes pay for, which includes regular meals and cable

I think we have our ideas of reality on different planes. I would much rather like not getting butt raped in the shower, than watch TV. I would like to do what I wish to do, to take a piss when I feel like it, go to sleep when I feel like it, you know, do what I want! You cannot do this in prison. Everything else you said has nothing to do with what we

are talking about.

Quote

Insert Quote

Needless to say, but if everyone were kept in prison and we implemented all the things you have noted link it would raise taxes skyhigh. Everytime a prisoner goes to the bathroom we are paying the bill and I still don't believe that genetics have anything to do with a person's behavior. I know that certain characteristic's of genetics like that they way people cross their legs is genetic, and how they sleep, but I don't think this carries much further than that. Also alot of the ideas you suggested were on the lines of cruel and unusual I'd say like crastrating people. Definately don't agree with that one.

Realy? How so. Added costs for castration is about it. And since lifetime encarceration is gone, aswell as the death penalty, I say taxes would be a bit lower. Aswell, since you would be a slave to the state for the time you are inprisoned, you give back to society by working. Building bridges and what not.

Because killing is not cruel and unusual. Please. Castration is no more cruel than killing.

Logged

solstice

Dreamwalker

Posts By Osmosis

\*\*\*\*\*

Posts: 2114

Karma: -5

"Receive and transmit..."

[View Profile](#)

Re: Eugenics

« Reply #56 on: November 10, 2005, 07:52:40 PM »

Quote

Everything else you said has nothing to do with what we are talking about.

Now, you are just being plane silly. How do RIGHTS have nothing to do with prisoner RIGHTS? You brought it up, remember.

Logged

Tell all the Truth but tell it slant: Success in Circuit lies. Too bright for our infirm Delight. The Truth's superb surprise. As Lightning to the Children eased, with explanation kind. The Truth must dazzle gradually, or every man be blind.

Tefeari: The Giant Impact Hypothesis is a theory

LightLink

Has a lot of posts  
Veritas Furniture

\*\*\*\*

Posts: 470  
Karma: 0

[View Profile](#)

Re: Eugenics

« Reply #57 on: November 10, 2005, 08:01:03 PM »

Because what you can do in prison has nothing to do with what happens before you get there. Not in a relevant way.

Logged  
solstice  
Dreamwalker  
Posts By Osmosis  
\*\*\*\*\*

Posts: 2114  
Karma: -5

"Receive and transmit..."

[View Profile](#)

Re: Eugenics

« Reply #58 on: November 10, 2005, 08:25:12 PM »

Quote

Because what you can do in prison has nothing to do with what happens before you get there. Not in a relevant way.

Wrong, again. Ever hear of minimum and maximum security prisons? And why would you say prisoners have "no rights" to saying that what they did has no bearing on those rights? The US legal system is set up so that not only do they get rights, but privileges and securities relative to what kind of sentence they are serving.

Logged  
Tell all the Truth but tell it slant: Success in Circuit lies. Too bright for our infirm Delight. The Truth's superb surprise. As Lightning to the Children eased, with explanation kind. The Truth must dazzle gradually, or every man be blind.  
Tefeari: The Giant Impact Hypothesis is a theory



kobok  
Veritas Council  
Tech Team  
Posts By Osmosis  
\*\*\*\*\*

Posts: 4766  
Karma: 150

Veritas Council

[View Profile](#)

Re: Eugenics

« Reply #59 on: November 11, 2005, 12:05:42 AM »

Quote from: LightLink on November 10, 2005, 04:20:13 PM

Also, if I am innocent and will be killed tommorow, I sure as hell would be more angry than just losing the ability to reproduce.

...

But lifetime imprisonment is dumb. You should only stay for a few years, as a slave to the state, so you can work for your room and board. That way you are not a useless leech to society, and it makes up for the money spent on you. And finally, you get released, and you can do as you please later. Unlike lifetime imprisonment which means you have no rights for the rest of your life.

First of all, no one in this thread is proposing killing prisoners, so this is a straw-man. We are comparing lifetime imprisonment and castration, and it is simply a straw-man to say that castration is better than killing, because these are not the two things being compared.

As for "lifetime imprisonment is dumb", I am baffled by your new proposal. You began this thread with a desire to reduce the number of crimes committed, and you proposed that a tiny reduction in crimes could be obtained by castrating those convicted of violent crimes. While this has been effectively refuted by the complete lack of statistical support for the hereditary nature of murder, what you are now proposing is taking murderers, making them build bridges for the a few years, and then releasing them back into society?!?

If you want a good statistic, how about that 1.5% of all released murderers kill again (and that's just counting the ones who manage to get caught twice). If you generalize it to simply violent crime, repeat rates are much higher. Prison sentences are not just a punishment, they are for the purpose of isolating society from dangerous individuals, so that they cannot hurt more people. Releasing all the murderers after a few years is one

of the worst and most dangerous proposals you've come up with yet, and would result in a lot of dead people.

If you think serving a lifetime prison sentence is too harsh of a punishment, then don't kill anyone. If you find yourself wrongfully convicted, then spend that time trying to figure out how to demonstrate your innocence. But don't just put murderers in the timeout chair, chop off their testicles, and then put them back on the streets. This would be utterly insane.

Logged

Want to learn psi? Check out our collection of psi articles.

Pages: 1 2 3 [4] 5 6 ... 9    Print

« previous next »

Jump to:

=> Main Hall

Powered by MySQL Powered by PHP    Powered by SMF 1.1.18 | SMF © 2013, Simple Machines

Oxygen design by Bloc    Valid XHTML 1.0! Valid CSS!

[http://vsociety.net/wiki/Political\\_Topics](http://vsociety.net/wiki/Political_Topics)

15 captures

3 Jul 2008 - 28 Aug 2016

Jul    AUG    Sep

28

2014   2016   2017

About this capture

Political Topics

PageDiscussionView sourceHistory

US Wiretapping

Thoughts on America

Who Actually Votes for Bush?

American Freedoms 1 - Bush 0

Congress vs. Online Communities

Stem Cell Research

Terrorists Arrested in Canada

FBI Raid Capitol Hill

Category: Significant Forum Topics

Navigation menu

Veritas Society

Main Page

Forums

IRC chat

Recent changes

Random page

Help

Search

Search

Tools

What links here

Related changes

Special pages

Printable version

Permanent link

Page information

Create accountLog in

This page was last modified on 20 July 2007, at 09:47. Privacy policy About Veritas

Disclaimers

Powered by MediaWiki

<http://forums.vociety.net/index.php?topic=10800.0>

4 captures

7 Jul 2010 - 17 Jul 2014

Sep JUL Aug

17

2011 2014 2015

About this capture

The Veritas Society

\*

\*HomeForumsChatHelpSearchRetroLoginRegister

Welcome, Guest. Please login or register.

Did you miss your activation email?

July 17, 2014, 02:32:28 AM

Forever

Login with username, password and session length

Search:

Advanced search

214929 Posts in 15321 Topics by 19763 Members - Latest Member: - ksyahu    Most  
online today: 103 - most online ever: 430 (June 28, 2007, 02:58:51 PM)

+ The Veritas Society

|-+ The Auditorium

| |-+ Main Hall

|| |-+ US Wiretapping Ok'd.      0 Members and 1 Guest are viewing this topic. «  
previous next »

Pages: [1]    Print

Author      Topic: US Wiretapping Ok'd. (Read 2926 times)

`Nazukarr

Posts By Osmosis

\*\*\*\*\*

Posts: 627

Karma: 15

View Profile

US Wiretapping Ok'd.

« on: July 07, 2007, 08:27:42 AM »

<http://www.freep.com/apps/pbcs.dll/article?AID=/20070707/NEWS06/707070364/1008>

Approved? What the hell. -\_-

Thoughts?

Logged

"I am not this hair, I am not this skin, I am the soul that lives within."

Adept

Posting chief

Posts By Osmosis

\*\*\*\*\*

Posts: 1145

Karma: 4

View Profile

Re: US Wiretapping Ok'd.

« Reply #1 on: July 07, 2007, 10:55:50 AM »

Big Brothers watching.

are they watching emails too? There's a bolded header there that says phone calls, emails but I didn't see mention of email in the article. either way, it's ridiculous. Times like this I'm glad I'm Canadian, though if I ever call an American/family in America/visit America, I'll be watched so it's still creepy.

Logged

Faijer  
Existential Pragmatist  
Veritas Moderator  
Posts By Osmosis  
\*\*\*\*\*

Posts: 3201  
Karma: 40

The Devil's Advocate

[View Profile WWW](#)

Re: US Wiretapping Ok'd.

« Reply #2 on: July 07, 2007, 11:03:22 AM »

Just watch. They'll implement something else soon. Soon after that, something else. People don't resist against gradual change, but if you were to put them all together and try to implement them at once, the streets would be filled with riots. The only way to prevent the slow but effective takeover of the Police State is to resist it at every turn.

Logged

My WordPress Blog is updated regularly.

NEW UPDATE: Life begins at conception: A thought experiment (29/08/2012)

kobok

Veritas Council  
Tech Team  
Posts By Osmosis  
\*\*\*\*\*

Posts: 4891  
Karma: 158

Veritas Council

[View Profile](#)

Re: US Wiretapping Ok'd.

« Reply #3 on: July 07, 2007, 12:38:33 PM »

I will emphasize the point stated in the article, yet not reflected in the title of the article or this thread, "Shapiro stressed that the decision didn't uphold the legality of the program, only whether the ACLU and other organizations and individuals involved in the suit had legal standing to challenge the program".

This ruling was of a more technical nature. It is unfortunate, but it is within the framework of existing precedent. Someone will have to be identified who was wrongfully wiretapped, and then that individual or group of individuals will have grounds to sue.

While the courts are the primary means of addressing unconstitutional actions by the government, there is unfortunately no real mechanism by which we can do so without first having an identified victim of such action.

Logged

Latest article: Construct Dynamics

Want to learn psi? Check out our collection of psi articles.

ThiefDeath

Posting chief

Posts By Osmosis

\*\*\*\*\*

Posts: 1544

Karma: 4

Grammaton Cleric

[View Profile](#)

Re: US Wiretapping Ok'd.

« Reply #4 on: July 07, 2007, 12:39:17 PM »

It would be ok if it were always going to be used for it's intended purpose - to combat terrorism. After all, what would you rather have: a few secret wiretaps or people dieing? But on the other hand I can't help but feel that this will probably be abused just like the Patriot Act.

Logged

[23:48] <DanielH> You guys are all strange

[23:48] <DanielH> You have a different way of thinking (which is wrong)

How about a shave?

kobok

Veritas Council  
Tech Team  
Posts By Osmosis

\*\*\*\*\*

Posts: 4891  
Karma: 158

Veritas Council

[View Profile](#)

Re: US Wiretapping Ok'd.

« Reply #5 on: July 07, 2007, 01:09:19 PM »

Quote from: ThiefDeath on July 07, 2007, 12:39:17 PM

It would be ok if it were always going to be used for it's intended purpose - to combat terrorism. After all, what would you rather have: a few secret wiretaps or people dieing? But on the other hand I can't help but feel that this will probably be abused just like the Patriot Act.

History shows such things will quite frequently be abused.

After all, if something were intended to combat terrorism, why not just get a warrant? The purpose of the warrant is simply to provide a third-party check to make sure things ARE being used to combat terrorism or other crimes. The only reason to remove that check is to try gain the power to use it for something OTHER than what warrants will issue for.

Logged

Latest article: Construct Dynamics

Want to learn psi? Check out our collection of psi articles.

solstice

Dreamwalker

Posts By Osmosis

\*\*\*\*\*

Posts: 2114  
Karma: -4

"Receive and transmit..."

[View Profile](#)

Re: US Wiretapping Ok'd.

« Reply #6 on: July 07, 2007, 02:38:42 PM »

Hate crimes, death by smoking and heart disease, and general homicide occur WAY more often than the handfull of alleged acts of "terrorism". Does any one see the Courts or the President fighting to keep us safe from those things with such persistence?

Logged

Tell all the Truth but tell it slant: Success in Circuit lies. Too bright for our infirm Delight. The Truth's superb surprise. As Lightning to the Children eased, with explanation kind. The Truth must dazzle gradually, or every man be blind.

Tefeari: The Giant Impact Hypothesis is a theory  
supadude

Super Villain

Posts By Osmosis

\*\*\*\*\*

Posts: 800

Karma: 16

[View Profile](#)

Re: US Wiretapping Ok'd.

« Reply #7 on: July 07, 2007, 02:52:33 PM »

face it. the people have lost control of the government, and the people are pesponsible for their governments, we have failed ourselves as americans. embarassed

Logged

[http://www.youtube.com/watch?v=JnA8GUtXpXY&feature=player\\_embedded](http://www.youtube.com/watch?v=JnA8GUtXpXY&feature=player_embedded)

A must see study for all!

The proud owner of the 200,000th post made on Veritas.

Adept

Posting chief

Posts By Osmosis

\*\*\*\*\*

Posts: 1145

Karma: 4

[View Profile](#)

Re: US Wiretapping Ok'd.



« Reply #8 on: July 07, 2007, 06:01:17 PM »

Actually, since your not old enough to vote supadue, you haven't failed anything...well, you haven't failed in respect to the governing of the U.S. anyway.

Logged

Right Now

Regular Member

A Familiar Feature

\*\*\*

Posts: 175

Karma: 0

We are all Sons and Daughters of god

[View Profile](#)

Re: US Wiretapping Ok'd.

« Reply #9 on: July 08, 2007, 09:47:22 AM »

All the shit thats going on in America is part of the reason why my family moved to Canada. I think what there doing is really stupid, and I hope there watching Bush too. I dont trust that guy.

Supadude we havent failed the government, its failed us and its trying to take advantage of us just because they think we hold no power in our hands.

Logged

kobok

Veritas Council

Tech Team

Posts By Osmosis

\*\*\*\*\*

Posts: 4891

Karma: 158

[Veritas Council](#)

[View Profile](#)

Re: US Wiretapping Ok'd.

« Reply #10 on: July 08, 2007, 01:50:27 PM »

Quote from: Right Now on July 08, 2007, 09:47:22 AM

Supadude we havent failed the government, its failed us and its trying to take advantage of us just because they think we hold no power in our hands.

It is a failure on the part of every voting-eligible citizen who blindly trusts the government, and every voting-eligible citizen who believes he or she cannot make a difference by voting or protesting.

This blind trust in the government goes to the core of problems with electronic voting, goes to the core of the problems we had with "weapons of mass destruction" leading to the war in Iraq, and goes to the core of the problems with this wiretapping issue.

With electronic voting, most citizens believe the officials running the elections and the vendors making the voting machines with no paper trail can be trusted (ironically, surveys show that computer experts almost unanimously distrust electronic voting machines with no paper trail, but the general public largely trusts them).

When we were all being fed a line of bull about "weapons of mass destruction" the overwhelming majority said, "Yes sir, you must have your national security reasons for not proving it to us, so we will trust you." Where were the people saying, "This is a democracy, prove it to us"? Anyone saying that was considered a fringe radical or a conspiracy nut for not trusting the government.

And when we come to wiretapping, there are still huge portions of the population who believe that they need to trust the government to do wiretapping without following procedures because that will help the government to catch the boogeymen for this generation, the terrorists. They come out with tired and naive cliches like, "Why are you so concerned if you're not doing anything wrong?" For this statement to even be spoken means that the speaker believes the individuals who compose the government can always be trusted to be benevolent, proper, and noble in their intentions and actions. This is so profoundly naive and counter to all historical evidence that it's not even funny.

So I would say that a majority of us have failed quite profoundly to use even the most basic elements of reason, and have failed to apply the most basic lessons of history. My only comfort and hope is that the enormous chaos and dissatisfaction that has resulted from this systemic case of mismanagement will be sufficient to wake people out of their drunken stupor.

Logged

Latest article: Construct Dynamics

Want to learn psi? Check out our collection of psi articles.

Big Boss

Friggen Crazy

Posts By Osmosis

\*\*\*\*\*

Posts: 1458

Karma: 3

Owner of 100000 V-Points

View Profile WWW

Re: US Wiretapping Ok'd.

« Reply #11 on: July 08, 2007, 09:26:41 PM »

quote from kobok

Quote

My only comfort and hope is that the enormous chaos and dissatisfaction that has resulted from this systemic case of mismanagement will be sufficient to wake people out of their drunken stupor.

Either we'll all wake up and start fixing things or it'll be red scare Macarthyism all over again, if it's not happening already, which it is...

Logged

Join my Folding@Home team and do some good! #159490

Details at <http://folding.stanford.edu/>

Bladesmith

A Familiar Feature

\*\*\*

Posts: 134

Karma: 0

---Bend the bar while the iron is hot.---

View Profile

Re: US Wiretapping Ok'd.

« Reply #12 on: July 09, 2007, 07:11:01 AM »

When it finally goes too far, look south of the Mason-Dixon line for the people who will shoot back first.

---The Bladesmith---

I'm back!

Logged

"Think not that I am come to send peace on earth: I came not to send peace, but a

sword."

-Jesus Christ (Matthew 10:34)

Pages: [1]    Print

« previous next »

Jump to:

=> Main Hall

Powered by MySQL Powered by PHP    Powered by SMF 1.1.19 | SMF © 2013, Simple Machines

Oxygen design by Bloc    Valid XHTML 1.0! Valid CSS!

<http://forums.vociety.net/index.php?topic=9323.0>

4 captures

7 Jul 2010 - 17 Jul 2014

Sep    JUL    Aug

17

2011    2014    2015

About this capture

The Veritas Society

\*

\*HomeForumsChatHelpSearchRetroLoginRegister

Welcome, Guest. Please login or register.

Did you miss your activation email?

July 17, 2014, 02:44:13 AM

Forever

Login with username, password and session length

Search:

Advanced search

214930 Posts in 15322 Topics by 19763 Members - Latest Member: - ksyahu    Most online today: 107 - most online ever: 430 (June 28, 2007, 02:58:51 PM)

+    The Veritas Society

| -+    The Auditorium

| | -+    Main Hall

| | | -+    America    0 Members and 1 Guest are viewing this topic. « previous next »

Pages: [1] 2    Print

Author    Topic: America    (Read 4686 times)

X\_wulven

Settling In

\*

Posts: 33

Karma: 0

[View Profile](#)

America

« on: October 08, 2006, 05:05:26 PM »

I had a sudden fit of curiosity and wonderd what people around here thought of the United States nowadays. Praises, rants, death threats....all are welcome.

Logged

"The meaning of life is not to live, but to survive the tortures of it and not let it break you, no matter what."

Arinil

Veritas Furniture

\*\*\*\*

Posts: 347

Karma: 0

Aspirant of the Wood

[View Profile](#)

Re: America

« Reply #1 on: October 08, 2006, 05:13:05 PM »

I live in the United States... huh

Logged

Whoever knows everything but himself, lacks everything. (Th 3)

ThiefDeath

Posting chief

Posts By Osmosis

\*\*\*\*\*

Posts: 1544

Karma: 4

Grammaton Cleric

[View Profile](#)

Re: America

« Reply #2 on: October 08, 2006, 05:13:11 PM »

I think it's doing rather well for a country that's trillions of dollars in debt.

Logged

[23:48] <DanielH> You guys are all strange

[23:48] <DanielH> You have a different way of thinking (which is wrong)

How about a shave?

ShadowStriker

Regular Member

A Familiar Feature

\*\*\*

Posts: 228

Karma: 0

All Around WTF

[View Profile](#)

Re: America

« Reply #3 on: October 08, 2006, 08:34:34 PM »

we need a better president and pray that they dont fuse the UCMJ with normal law

Logged

The Strong Take From the Weak, The Smart Take From The Strong, The Quick Take From The Smart, And The Weak Rise Up Against Them All

ThiefDeath

Posting chief

Posts By Osmosis

\*\*\*\*\*

Posts: 1544

Karma: 4

Grammaton Cleric

[View Profile](#)

Re: America

« Reply #4 on: October 08, 2006, 08:44:55 PM »

Quote from: ShadowStriker on October 08, 2006, 08:34:34 PM

and pray that they dont fuse the UCMJ with normal law

Why would they do that?

Logged

[23:48] <DanielH> You guys are all strange

[23:48] <DanielH> You have a different way of thinking (which is wrong)

How about a shave?

Rafnul!

he-who-posts-lots

Veritas Moderator

Posts By Osmosis

\*\*\*\*\*

Posts: 1081

Karma: 28

[View Profile](#)

Re: America

« Reply #5 on: October 08, 2006, 09:49:11 PM »

The country is alright. It's imperfect. The nice thing is, over time, as new people get elected, the problems and errors of the past get corrected as the generations pass. It's a form of government that constantly renews itself (albeit seemingly slowly when you are young).

Logged

Razeroth

Veritas Furniture

\*\*\*\*

Posts: 269

Karma: 0

Ut intus , sic vacuus. As within, so without.

[View Profile](#)

Re: America

« Reply #6 on: October 08, 2006, 11:19:57 PM »

Yeah, all governments are merely a cycle. It is like the dynasty cycle developed as a result of different ruling dynasties in ancient China.

Basically, all ancient dynasties in China followed this cycle of rule:

1. The dynasty comes into power.
2. The dynasty flourishes while a favorable family member does well as ruler.
3. The dynasty begins to corrupt as different members of the specific ruling family don't do as well commanding their society. Many people in the dynasty notice this.
4. Ultimately, the dynasty is overthrown by a new ruling family and another dynasty is created. This isn't necessarily done violently, but with political movements as a result of the inherent corruption in the old dynasty.

This basic pattern can, more or less, be applied to all governments today, albeit the process is a bit slower in communism than in democracy because democracy has sovereignty. But really, you see it happen all the time. Every 4-8 years in the U.S. it happens, and it happened relatively recently in Iraq with Saddam Husein. The cycle always continues as society corrects itself.

-Razeroth

Logged

"In the beginning, the primum mobile created the heavens and the earth, and imparted existence. The governing principle of the universe thusforth came forth: duality in its glory..."

Faijer

Existential Pragmatist

Veritas Moderator

Posts By Osmosis

\*\*\*\*\*

Posts: 3201

Karma: 40

The Devil's Advocate

[View Profile WWW](#)

Re: America

« Reply #7 on: October 09, 2006, 06:40:24 AM »

It's quite large...

What... You wanted an opinion of the politics? Tough Wink

Logged



My WordPress Blog is updated regularly.

NEW UPDATE: Life begins at conception: A thought experiment (29/08/2012)

Raitaro

Posts By Osmosis

\*\*\*\*\*

Posts: 2151

Karma: 0

The Knight of Wands

View Profile

Re: America

« Reply #8 on: October 09, 2006, 02:04:31 PM »

Its allmost like Rome.

When Rome destroyed Carthage (its main power check) it became completely decadent and consequerntly it fell (to the Germans but thats not important) America doesn't have a power check anymore so... \*waits for the anarchy\*

Logged

The IneptInitiate

<http://xkcd.com/303/>

<http://xkcd.com/123/>

I got a hot girl and the coolest band I know. I gotta bad habbit of smoking before the show.

I got music I got friends I trust and love. I get into a lot of fights and now my knuckles are all fucked up.....

ThiefDeath

Posting chief

Posts By Osmosis

\*\*\*\*\*

Posts: 1544

Karma: 4

Grammaton Cleric

View Profile

Re: America

« Reply #9 on: October 09, 2006, 04:30:26 PM »

America still has power checks. The basic constitutional structure of our government hasn't changed at all. There are still three branches of the government: judicial, legislative, and executive, which all have checks and balances against each other.

Logged

[23:48] <DanielH> You guys are all strange

[23:48] <DanielH> You have a different way of thinking (which is wrong)

How about a shave?

Natus Denuo

Veritas Furniture

Veritas Furniture

\*\*\*\*

Posts: 424

Karma: 0

Son of A Gun!

[View Profile](#)

Re: America

« Reply #10 on: October 10, 2006, 09:10:46 AM »

America?

Like all things, it's good or bad, depending on where you are...literally in this discussion. A good majority of america's states are dreadfully boring when I've had the misfortune of visiting them...not to mention every other person was an imbecile. I havent met \*every\* person in MIDDAL AMURIKAH, but enough to assume that ignorant social conservatism does rule. And that's no place I'd like to be.

I live in a rather conservative town in Ohio, USSA...hate it; I cant wait until college and then afterwards, moving out to Seattle.

I personally believe America is 70% shit, and 30% decent-good. The general premise is good; the way it's bastardized every fucking five seconds is depressing, though.

Logged

Quote from: kobok

As for TVs, if you need an expensive and phallic representation of your manhood which will go bad in a short period of time, buy plasma. Otherwise, buy an LCD.

Raitaro

Posts By Osmosis

\*\*\*\*\*

Posts: 2151

Karma: 0

The Knight of Wands

View Profile

Re: America

« Reply #11 on: October 10, 2006, 10:05:27 AM »

Quote from: ThiefDeath on October 09, 2006, 04:30:26 PM

America still has power checks. The basic constitutional structure of our government hasn't changed at all. There are still three branches of the government: judicial, legislative, and executive, which all have checks and balances against eachother.

Its not the same, I mean America as an "empire"

Logged

The IneptInitiate

<http://xkcd.com/303/>

<http://xkcd.com/123/>

I got a hot girl and the coolest band I know. I gotta bad habbit of smoking before the show.

I got music I got friends I trust and love. I get into a lot of fights and now my knuckles are all fucked up.....

Rafnul!

he-who-posts-lots

Veritas Moderator

Posts By Osmosis

\*\*\*\*\*

Posts: 1081

Karma: 28

View Profile

Re: America

« Reply #12 on: October 10, 2006, 11:37:36 AM »

America isn't an empire. It's subject to criticism by the youth, who one day inevitably end up ruling the country.

Logged

Raitaro  
Posts By Osmosis

\*\*\*\*\*

Posts: 2151  
Karma: 0

The Knight of Wands

View Profile

Re: America  
« Reply #13 on: October 10, 2006, 11:43:51 AM »  
Supposedly O.o  
Logged  
The IneptInitiate  
<http://xkcd.com/303/>  
<http://xkcd.com/123/>

I got a hot girl and the coolest band I know. I gotta bad habbit of smoking before the show.

I got music I got friends I trust and love. I get into a lot of fights and now my knuckles are all fucked up.....

Arinil

Veritas Furniture

\*\*\*\*

Posts: 347  
Karma: 0

Aspirant of the Wood

View Profile

Re: America  
« Reply #14 on: October 10, 2006, 05:19:54 PM »  
Quote

America isn't an empire. It's subject to criticism by the youth, who one day inevitably end up ruling the country.

Unless we do something REALLY stupid and end up dead/communist in the next ten

years huh (Both of which are similar...)

Logged

Whoever knows everything but himself, lacks everything. (Th 3)

Pages: [1] 2 Print

« previous next »

Jump to:

=> Main Hall

Powered by MySQL Powered by PHP Powered by SMF 1.1.19 | SMF © 2013, Simple Machines

Oxygen design by Bloc Valid XHTML 1.0! Valid CSS!

<http://forums.vociety.net/index.php/topic%2C9323.15.html>

1 capture

07 Jul 2010

Jun JUL Aug

07

2009 2010 2011

About this capture

The Veritas Society

\*

\*HomeForumsChatHelpSearchLoginRegister

Welcome, Guest. Please login or register.

Did you miss your activation email?

July 07, 2010, 03:13:11 PM

Forever

Login with username, password and session length

Search:

Advanced search

166556 Posts in 12245 Topics by 6539 Members - Latest Member: - VeritaSeraph

Most online today: 82 - most online ever: 430 (June 28, 2007, 02:58:51 PM)

+ The Veritas Society

|-+ The Auditorium

||-+ Main Hall

|||-+ America 0 Members and 1 Guest are viewing this topic. « previous next »

Pages: 1 [2] Print

Author Topic: America (Read 1987 times)

Big Boss

Friggen Crazy

Veritas Moderator  
Posts By Osmosis

\*\*\*\*\*

Posts: 1456

Owner of 100000 V-Points

View Profile WWW

Re: America

« Reply #15 on: October 11, 2006, 12:38:17 AM »

I dunno what to think at the moment. I find the Daily Show to have its head on more securely than any other news station, and that's sad since the Daily Show is fake news... When things like that go on in america, you don't really have much to turn to.

Logged

Join my Folding@Home team and do some good! #159490

Details at <http://folding.stanford.edu/>

kobok

Veritas Council

Tech Team

Posts By Osmosis

\*\*\*\*\*

Posts: 3885

Veritas Council

View Profile

Re: America

« Reply #16 on: October 11, 2006, 05:18:43 AM »

Quote from: Raitaro on October 09, 2006, 02:04:31 PM

Its allmost like Rome.

When Rome destroyed Carthage (its main power check) it became completely decadent and consequerntly it fell (to the Germans but thats not important) America doesn't have a power check anymore so... \*waits for the anarchy\*

America still has mechanisms which CAN check power, it's just that lately, it has frequently been the case that these institutions do NOT check power. The reasons for this center around ideology, political self-interest for career politicians, propaganda, public attention, and public will.

Of these sources of the problem, propaganda is the most potent and potentially controllable, and it leads to most of the other problems, including directing public ideology, public attention, and public will. For the first sign of propaganda, watch for people redefining the discussion. If you can define the language, you can control a democracy in ways that are difficult for people to oppose.

The modern centerpoint for this is the phrase "war on terror". Terror is a terrible evil, and so opposing it is the only reasonable choice of good people. So if you can DEFINE a set of actions as a "war on terror", and ingrain that definition into the minds of people, then you have structured the debate by definition in a way that you cannot be opposed. Then anyone who opposes your methodology is defined as opposing the stopping of evil, even if the conclusions resulting from this definition do not correspond to reality. This is the essence of the goal of propaganda. Frame a viewpoint in a certain way in people's minds so that a significant majority MUST support your view without thinking, questioning, or critical appraisal.

Language is powerful, and verbal structures like that allow politicians to control almost everyone. Only a small minority of people with a skeptical, cynical, or critical interpretation of what they are told, or those who are trained in the interpretation of rhetoric, will be resistant to propaganda of this form. But a small minority like this is irrelevant, because in a democracy they are easily suppressed and dismissed as fringe radicals. Therefore, checks of power will remain suppressed as long as politicians are allowed to maintain control of the language which frames the debate about their actions.

If you wish to be a part of the solution and not the problem, train yourself to identify propaganda immediately, and train yourself to respond internally to questions like, "Do you support the war on terror?" with a response like, "What war on terror?" Reject the premise of the question, and you reject the propaganda. And then discuss things in terms of what factually exists, and not in terms of the political language that is defined for you.

Logged  
solstice  
Dreamwalker  
Posts By Osmosis  
\*\*\*\*\*

Posts: 2109

"Receive and transmit..."

[View Profile](#)

Re: America  
« Reply #17 on: October 11, 2006, 10:25:11 AM »  
"War on Terror" = Family Feud.

What is something you would not find in a war on terror? Survey says: terrorists Wink  
Logged

Tell all the Truth but tell it slant: Success in Circuit lies. Too bright for our infirm  
Delight. The Truth's superb surprise. As Lightning to the Children eased, with  
explanation kind. The Truth must dazzle gradually, or every man be blind.

Tefeari: The Giant Impact Hypothesis is a theory

Big Boss

Friggen Crazy

Veritas Moderator

Posts By Osmosis

\*\*\*\*\*

Posts: 1456

Owner of 100000 V-Points

[View Profile WWW](#)

Re: America

« Reply #18 on: October 11, 2006, 11:21:55 AM »

don't forget weapons of mass destruction...

Logged

Join my Folding@Home team and do some good! #159490

Details at <http://folding.stanford.edu/>

NathanE

BEEFCAKE BEEFCAKE

Veritas Furniture

\*\*\*\*

Posts: 381

[View Profile](#)

Re: America

« Reply #19 on: October 11, 2006, 01:50:08 PM »

I would say what you would find would america trying to force ideals on another nation  
trying to make them 'civilized' though it takes a progression to do that not a military  
force... it has to be a good idea uncorrupted by propaganda.

Logged

ThiefDeath

Posting chief

Posts By Osmosis



\*\*\*\*\*

Posts: 1499

Grammaton Cleric

[View Profile](#)

Re: America

« Reply #20 on: October 11, 2006, 04:12:10 PM »

I believe that the true motivation behind most of America's foreign policy has to do with gaining money and resources rather than imposing ideals. It may look like we are trying to free Iraqis of an oppressive government and replace it with democracy on the outside, but on the inside it probably just has to do with oil.

Logged

[23:48] <DanielH> You guys are all strange

[23:48] <DanielH> You have a different way of thinking (which is wrong)

How about a shave?

Philosopher

Veritas Furniture

\*\*\*\*\*

Posts: 316

Bah.

[View Profile](#)

Re: America

« Reply #21 on: October 15, 2006, 02:35:01 PM »

Quote from: Martial Thoughts on October 11, 2006, 11:21:55 AM

don't forget weapons of mass destruction...

I'm fairly sure You'll find them if you look in the right place, mostly I'm thinking in American silos.

Logged

Pages: 1 [2] [Print](#)

« [previous](#) [next](#) »

Jump to:

=> [Main Hall](#)

Simple Machines LLC

Oxygen design by Bloc    Valid XHTML 1.0! Valid CSS!

<http://forums.vrsociety.net/index.php?topic=8854.0>

4 captures

7 Jul 2010 - 17 Jul 2014

Sep   JUL   Aug

17

2011   2014   2015

About this capture

The Veritas Society

\*

[\\*Home](#)[Forums](#)[Chat](#)[Help](#)[Search](#)[Retro](#)[Login](#)[Register](#)

Welcome, Guest. Please login or register.

Did you miss your activation email?

July 17, 2014, 03:17:34 AM

Forever

Login with username, password and session length

Search:

Advanced search

214930 Posts in 15322 Topics by 19763 Members - Latest Member: - ksyahu    Most  
online today: 110 - most online ever: 430 (June 28, 2007, 02:58:51 PM)

+ The Veritas Society

|-+ The Auditorium

||-+ Main Hall

|||-+ Who actually votes for bush?    0 Members and 1 Guest are viewing this topic.

« previous next »

Pages: [1] 2 3 ... 6    Print

Author    Topic: Who actually votes for bush? (Read 8290 times)

TheThing

Posts By Osmosis

\*\*\*\*\*

Posts: 561

Karma: 0

[View Profile](#)

Who actually votes for bush?

« on: August 09, 2006, 05:14:38 AM »

Who actually votes for bush? Apart from rednecks and fundamentalist christians I can't understand why anyone would. Unless they have a family member in the army or something.

I'm not american please explain to me why you all vote for him?

Logged

TheThings's Flatmate.

Rafnul!

he-who-posts-lots

Veritas Moderator

Posts By Osmosis

\*\*\*\*\*

Posts: 1081

Karma: 28

[View Profile](#)

Re: Who actually votes for bush?

« Reply #1 on: August 09, 2006, 05:51:02 AM »

Perhaps because all of the terrible things happening in the world, he was the best candidate at the time.

Logged

perfectcircle.

Settling In

\*

Posts: 15

Karma: 0

[View Profile](#)

Re: Who actually votes for bush?

« Reply #2 on: August 09, 2006, 07:27:41 AM »

perhaps cause kerry was a dickhead. and bush was less of one. haha.

Logged

Mobius

Veritas Council

Veritas Furniture

\*\*\*\*\*

Posts: 329  
Karma: 25

Fundamental Psi Coordinator

[View Profile](#)

Re: Who actually votes for bush?

« Reply #3 on: August 09, 2006, 07:34:11 AM »

Something seems fundamentally flawed about a democratic system when an election of a major leader involves choosing between "the lesser of two evils".

Logged

Deus Ex Vir

Enchia

Posts By Osmosis

\*\*\*\*\*

Posts: 974  
Karma: 28

[View Profile](#)

Re: Who actually votes for bush?

« Reply #4 on: August 09, 2006, 08:17:05 AM »

There are a lot of reasons to vote for bush;

First of all what Gemini said choosing between two evils. Secondly one can vote for bush because he agrees with him and thirdly one can vote against Kerry.

A big flaw in the democratic system in America is that you can only vote for two presidents.

Here in the Netherlands one does not vote for a prime minister but we vote for a political party. The more people vote for a party the more seats they get in the parliament. There are 150 of those seats in the Parliament and a cabinet has to have 76 or more of the seats to have a majority. The winner of the election can decide with which party or parties they want to form a government with. For example the Labor party is the winner with 45 seats in the cabinet they have to find an other party or parties who wants to join them. (they have to make compromise though) As long as they have 76 or more seats.

Logged  
kakkarot  
0. The Fool... Inverted?  
Posts By Osmosis  
\*\*\*\*\*  
Posts: 2701  
Karma: 3

Pirate "Not-A-Mod" BoB

[View Profile](#)

Re: Who actually votes for bush?  
« Reply #5 on: August 09, 2006, 10:29:17 AM »  
Because the elections were rigged everyone loves Bush ^\_^

~kakkarot

Logged  
Philippians 2:5 Your attitude should be the same as that of Christ Jesus: 6 Who, being in very nature God, did not consider equality with God something to be grasped, 7 but made himself nothing, taking the very nature of a servant, being made in human likeness.

kobok  
Veritas Council  
Tech Team  
Posts By Osmosis  
\*\*\*\*\*  
Posts: 4891  
Karma: 158

Veritas Council

[View Profile](#)

Re: Who actually votes for bush?  
« Reply #6 on: August 09, 2006, 11:01:15 AM »  
Among the major reasons people voted against Kerry were:

1. He was portrayed in the media by talking points as a "flip-flopper" who "waffled" from one stance to the other, although his actual platform was reasonably consistent if you look at the details. This was a strategy created by Karl Rove (political advisor to Bush) to preemptively shield criticism against Bush's obstinate stubbornness.
2. People believed Kerry was unemotional and lacked compassion, because as a public speaker, Kerry's voice was often monotonous, particularly when he was tired. In addition, his face was reduced in emotional expression by a botox injection that he took in order to look more strong and youthful (a poor choice). This gave George Bush a substantial edge in the poll, "Which candidate would you rather invite to a backyard barbecue?" (Despite the laughable nature of this question, it actually has a decent influence on who a significant portion of the population will vote for.)
3. A decent percentage of people (largely from red states) believe that Democrats are weak on defense. While in reality, Kerry served in active combat, these individuals still believe Bush is more competent to lead a military because he's not an "arrogant liberal".
4. The U.S. is in the midst of a fierce culture war. In red states, and many rural areas of blue states, there is a belief that "liberals", and those who eat tofu, or drink lattes, or those who make movies, or those who go to Europe, are all part of a vast cultural conspiracy to corrupt everything which is good about America. They believe that liberals control the media in the U.S., except for Fox News, and use this media to corrupt the minds of people into unamerican ways. Kerry is from Massachusetts, and while his father was working at an embassy in Norway, he went to a boarding school in Europe. These two things make Kerry too "liberal" to support, because they are major signs to red-staters that he's from the wrong subculture.

People voted for Bush because:

1. They believed he was a better Christian. Certainly Bush talks about his religion more, but it is fairly questionable to claim that his policies at all correspond to the path promoted by Jesus.
2. Bush looks like a friendly guy, who understands and supports their distrust of intellectuals and academics.

Electronic voting machines supported Bush because:

1. Electronic voting machines can be made to support whoever their controller wants.

Logged  
Latest article: Construct Dynamics

Want to learn psi? Check out our collection of psi articles.

`Nazukarr

Posts By Osmosis

\*\*\*\*\*

Posts: 627  
Karma: 15

[View Profile](#)

Re: Who actually votes for bush?

« Reply #7 on: August 09, 2006, 03:38:38 PM »

Quote from: Enchia on August 09, 2006, 08:17:05 AM

There are a lot of reasons to vote for bush;

First of all what Gemini said choosing between two evils. Secondly one can vote for bush because he agrees with him and thirdly one can vote against Kerry.

A big flaw in the democratic system in America is that you can only vote for two presidents.

Here in the Netherlands one does not vote for a prime minister but we vote for a political party. The more people vote for a party the more seats they get in the parliament. There are 150 of those seats in the Parliament and a cabinet has to have 76 or more of the seats to have a majority. The winner of the election can decide with which party or parties they want to form a government with. For example the Labor party is the winner with 45 seats in the cabinet they have to find an other party or parties who wants to join them. (they have to make compromise though) As long as they have 76 or more seats.

The reason we usually only have two candidates running for president is because most Americans support either one of our two major political parties -- The Democrats and the Republicans. Of course, we've also had other candidates from smaller parties run, but they weren't really successful (\*coughralphnadcough\*). Also, if I know my stuff, once the president is voted in, the party that he runs for gets dibs on the White house. The old staff gets booted out, and the new staff takes its place. The congress, on the otherhand, stays the same since that's a state thing.

Quote from: TheThing on August 09, 2006, 05:14:38 AM

Who actually votes for bush? Apart from rednecks and fundamentalist christians I can't understand why anyone would. Unless they have a family member in the army or something.

I'm not american please explain to me why you all vote for him?

People vote for Bush for a lot of reasons. The people listed above are more radical, more conservative, more...ignorant. In other words, these are the types of people that buy into the propaganda that is thrown around by this party ("Immigrants are stealing jobs from Amerka!" "Homosexuality isn't natural" ect.) However, there are more politically informed republicans that have legitimate reasons on why they choose to vote

for Bush -- a lot of them being economic reasons. See, they want to make the rich richer and the poor poorer Tongue.

Quote from: `Gemini on August 09, 2006, 07:34:11 AM

Something seems fundamentally flawed about a democratic system when an election of a major leader involves choosing between "the lesser of two evils".

Hehehe. 'Choosing between the two greater evils'. We didn't have to choose between the two greater evils in the last two elections. Ralph Nader is a man that stood for what was right rather than being a self-centered greedy asshole. But yeah, everyone knows that no one from a minority political party was going to win anyway.

But yeah, democrats and republicans. They are BOTH evil. I agree with Michael Moore's analogy - the republicans are those huge, ugly roaches that roam your beautiful homes and infests them with diseases. The democrats, on the other hand, are the invisible termites that chew up your house behind the scenes, and then one day ---- BOOM. Your house falls apart on itself while you're sleeping in your comfy bed.

But as you can see, the democrats can do it in STYLE Smiley. Our last president, Bill Clinton, did NOTHING to help America. He kept everything the same. He told everyone he would do one thing, then did the other. He signed 27 new laws into place a couple of weeks Bush came into power -- knowing that Bush would barge and change everything back. It was for the damn reputation. He outlawed gay marriage, kicked 10 million people off of welfare, and signed orders banning illegal immigrants from getting health care.

But see, he got away with it... because he had a charming smile. The democrats pretend to care for the poor, but they're still holding hands with big business, and they're not going to let go any time soon. But again, he was charming. People felt at ease around him. The countries around the world were at PEACE (excluding middle eastern) Bush isn't charming, and he isn't clever. He's blunt, and mean. As soon as he came into power people started to go into war again ( See the Palestinians and Israelis, the Yugoslavians [I think], ect.). He's illiterate at best. He's a felon.

Billy was crap for America, but the world was safe. Bush is crap for America, and now the world is at war. At this point, if the war continues, it would probably be wisest to vote for the roaches, since the termites wouldn't do very well with America, and wouldn't be able to handle the war.

\*shakes fist\* Dont trust any of them!

« Last Edit: August 09, 2006, 03:51:58 PM by Nazukarr »      Logged

"I am not this hair, I am not this skin, I am the soul that lives within."

Big Boss

Friggen Crazy

Posts By Osmosis



\*\*\*\*\*

Posts: 1458

Karma: 3

Owner of 100000 V-Points

[View Profile WWW](#)

Re: Who actually votes for bush?

« Reply #8 on: August 09, 2006, 05:14:56 PM »

consider Frankiln Delano Roosevelt. He was a major leader during a major war. World war 2. If you have somebody in charge of the military to try and win for you, you don't want to screw up his plans and put somebody else in office. Leave the people with the know-how in charge. That would explain why FDR was elected for 4 terms. Bush started a war, (not even an official declared war, but hey. he just needs to keep extending his military priveleges.) and it seems like the best idea to let him carry out his plans. At least, that's probably what everyone is subconsciously thinking.

Quote

Also, if I know my stuff, once the president is voted in, the party that he runs for gets dibs on the White house.

that's essentially correct. The president appoints his cabinet members. The cabinet is purely traditional and actually holds no power constitutionally, but it is useful when you consider all that a president would have to do alone without one.

Quote

A big flaw in the democratic system in America is that you can only vote for two presidents.

If I recall correctly, there were at least 5 presidential candidates on my ballot when I voted. The problem is that the two biggest ones are republicans and democrats, and their propaganda is "you are throwing your vote away if you don't vote rep. or dem." If everyone would just understand that you ARE NOT throwing your vote away if everyone voted for who they ACTUALLY wanted for president, instead of the best looking guy, or the best speaker, or the one with the most "promises."

Logged

Join my Folding@Home team and do some good! #159490

Details at <http://folding.stanford.edu/>

Darkflame

Frequent poster

Posts By Osmosis

\*\*\*\*\*

Posts: 556

Karma: 1

武礼久

[View Profile](#)

Re: Who actually votes for bush?

« Reply #9 on: August 09, 2006, 07:44:56 PM »

Quote from: kobok on August 09, 2006, 11:01:15 AM

there is a belief that "liberals", and those who eat tofu, or drink lattes, or those who make movies, or those who go to Europe, are all part of a vast cultural conspiracy to corrupt everything which is good about America. They believe that liberals control the media in the U.S., except for Fox News, and use this media to corrupt the minds of people into unamerican ways.

wtf... I thought that sort of thing was just a joke view of those "rude Americans". Are there people actually like that? O\_o

Logged

<kobok> Link isn't wearing any pants.

<kobok> What sort of goblin porn is this?

<Prophecy> Darkflame: A swift punch to one of the eyes has marvellous results.

kobok

Veritas Council

Tech Team

Posts By Osmosis

\*\*\*\*\*

Posts: 4891

Karma: 158

Veritas Council

[View Profile](#)

Re: Who actually votes for bush?

« Reply #10 on: August 09, 2006, 11:57:34 PM »

Quote from: Martial Thoughts on August 09, 2006, 05:14:56 PM

If I recall correctly, there were at least 5 presidential candidates on my ballot when I voted. The problem is that the two biggest ones are republicans and democrats, and their propaganda is "you are throwing your vote away if you don't vote rep. or dem." If everyone would just understand that you ARE NOT throwing your vote away if everyone voted for who they ACTUALLY wanted for president, instead of the best looking guy, or the best speaker, or the one with the most "promises."

Except that, unfortunately, you ARE throwing away your vote if votes are split among more than two candidates. This is not propaganda, this is a mathematical consequence of game theory. The reason you are throwing your vote away is the following:

Situation: Candidate A and B are the two most popular candidates, and candidate C is less popular. You like candidate C most, but if you had to choose, you like candidate B more than A. This is the most common situation, since usually the platform of candidate C overlaps slightly more with one of the two popular candidates than the other.

The voting system in use in the U.S. in most states assigns all of the electoral college votes to the candidate in that state who receives the "most" votes. So now you need to consider both the situation in which candidate C is voted for by people who like candidate C, and the situation in which people who vote for candidate C choose their favorite of candidate A or B. In this example case, a majority of the people who support candidate C would choose B over A.

So lets say people vote for candidate C who like him, and lets say 25% of people like him:

A gets 40% of the votes.  
B gets 35% of the votes.  
C gets 25% of the votes.

Therefore, A wins, and gets all of the electoral college votes.

Alternatively, lets say a mere 65% of the people who liked candidate C would prefer candidate B over candidate A. So if everyone votes for just candidate A or B, the result is then:

A gets 48.75% of the votes.  
B gets 51.25% of the votes.

Therefore, B wins, and gets all of the electoral college votes.

Now, in the first case, the people who voted for candidate C actually preferred B over A,

and because of the way they voted, the worst case scenario happened for them, and they caused the candidate they liked least to win. This is called a spoiler vote, and it is why third party votes are generally unproductive within our voting system. The problem is not exactly the parties, or the media, or the citizens. The problem is the way votes are processed.

If you don't like this fact, then you need to focus your energy on changing the way our voting system works.

Under approval voting (see preceding link), it's possible for candidate A to get 49% approval, candidate B to get 52% approval, and candidate C to get 60% approval if more total voters actually like candidate C, and no one has thrown away any votes or risked pushing the election result in some way counter to their approval.

Quote from: Darkflame

wtf... I thought that sort of thing was just a joke view of those "rude Americans". Are there people actually like that? O\_o

Unfortunately yes. They are not a majority, but their views and policies can dominate the politics in some regions of the country. Our system of electing party candidates via a primary election before the general election has a tendency sometimes to amplify the views of the more extreme aspects of a party which can be most easily rallied around emotional issues.

« Last Edit: August 10, 2006, 12:01:08 AM by kobok » Logged

Latest article: Construct Dynamics

Want to learn psi? Check out our collection of psi articles.

Big Boss

Friggen Crazy

Posts By Osmosis

\*\*\*\*\*

Posts: 1458

Karma: 3

Owner of 100000 V-Points

[View Profile WWW](#)

Re: Who actually votes for bush?

« Reply #11 on: August 10, 2006, 02:18:43 AM »

kobok, I'm aware of how the electoral college works. What I was trying to state is that I think there are more third party supporters than the democrats and republicans allow us

to believe. They tell us we're throwing our vote away and that the third party will never win because they aren't one of the major two parties. If candidate C get's a majority in votes in a state, then we would see the electoral votes of that state go to them. It does happen, not in any recent time, but it has. unless the change is a radical one then the spoiler effect will happen again and again and will deterr potential third party voters, reinforcing the "throw away" idea. unfortunately, not everyone will do what I say... yet... mwahahaaa.

Logged

Join my Folding@Home team and do some good! #159490

Details at <http://folding.stanford.edu/>

solstice

Dreamwalker

Posts By Osmosis

\*\*\*\*\*

Posts: 2114

Karma: -4

"Receive and transmit..."

View Profile

Re: Who actually votes for bush?

« Reply #12 on: August 10, 2006, 02:34:12 AM »

Sorry, but I would rather have an "dickhead" with a facial boobjob than a biggoted redneck. Bush stomps on the Constitution in so many ways.

Guys not in the US: the popular vote does not determine who is our president. The States' leaders are the ones who determine this, which means such elections can be rigged to death.

Logged

Tell all the Truth but tell it slant: Success in Circuit lies. Too bright for our infirm Delight. The Truth's superb surprise. As Lightning to the Children eased, with explanation kind. The Truth must dazzle gradually, or every man be blind.

Tefeari: The Giant Impact Hypothesis is a theory

Big Boss

Friggen Crazy

Posts By Osmosis

\*\*\*\*\*

Posts: 1458

Karma: 3

Owner of 100000 V-Points

[View Profile WWW](#)

Re: Who actually votes for bush?

« Reply #13 on: August 10, 2006, 04:27:16 AM »

Quote

The States' leaders are the ones who determine this, which means such elections can be rigged to death.

as far as I know that hasn't been a known problem. the congressman decide where the electoral votes go, but if they decide to give out votes against what the people voted for, there will be some complaining, and nail batting. The Veritas Teethy!

Logged

Join my Folding@Home team and do some good! #159490

Details at <http://folding.stanford.edu/>

Rafnul!

he-who-posts-lots

Veritas Moderator

Posts By Osmosis

\*\*\*\*\*

Posts: 1081

Karma: 28

[View Profile](#)

Re: Who actually votes for bush?

« Reply #14 on: August 10, 2006, 07:55:00 AM »

"Bigotted Redneck" - Because he grew up in Texas? That's racial profiling if I've ever heard it.

« Last Edit: August 10, 2006, 11:23:23 AM by Rafnul! »

Logged

Pages: [1] 2 3 ... 6   [Print](#)

[« previous](#) [next »](#)

[Jump to:](#)

[=> Main Hall](#)

Powered by MySQL Powered by PHP Powered by SMF 1.1.19 | SMF © 2013, Simple Machines

Oxygen design by Bloc Valid XHTML 1.0! Valid CSS!  
<http://forums.v society.net/index.php/topic%2C8854.15.html>

1 capture

07 Jul 2010

Jun JUL Aug

07

2009 2010 2011

About this capture  
The Veritas Society

\*

\*HomeForumsChatHelpSearchLoginRegister

Welcome, Guest. Please login or register.

Did you miss your activation email?

July 07, 2010, 03:32:27 PM

Forever

Login with username, password and session length

Search:

Advanced search

166556 Posts in 12245 Topics by 6539 Members - Latest Member: - VeritaSeraph

Most online today: 82 - most online ever: 430 (June 28, 2007, 02:58:51 PM)

+ The Veritas Society

|-+ The Auditorium

| |-+ Main Hall

|| |-+ Who actually votes for bush? 0 Members and 1 Guest are viewing this topic.

« previous next »

Pages: 1 [2] 3 4 ... 6Print

Author Topic: Who actually votes for bush? (Read 5082 times)

`Nazukarr

Veritas Furniture

\*\*\*\*

Posts: 492

View Profile

Re: Who actually votes for bush?

« Reply #15 on: August 10, 2006, 09:56:12 AM »

Quote from: Rafnul! on August 10, 2006, 07:55:00 AM

"Bigotted Redneck" - Because he was born in Texas? That's racial profiling if I've ever heard it.

Well, Bush and Kerry are both white so I doubt its 'racial' profiling. But then again, Bush does look and sound like a 'redneck' at times.

Logged

"I'm SO glad you asked. Kabbalah is a wonderful religion that mixes the fun part of Judaism with MAGIC! My friend Madonna..." -- Jenna Maroney

kobok

Veritas Council

Tech Team

Posts By Osmosis

\*\*\*\*\*

Posts: 3885

Veritas Council

[View Profile](#)

Re: Who actually votes for bush?

« Reply #16 on: August 10, 2006, 11:20:28 AM »

Quote from: Martial Thoughts on August 10, 2006, 02:18:43 AM

kobok, I'm aware of how the electoral college works. What I was trying to state is that I think there are more third party supporters than the democrats and republicans allow us to believe. They tell us we're throwing our vote away and that the third party will never win because they aren't one of the major two parties. If candidate C get's a majority in votes in a state, then we would see the electoral votes of that state go to them. It does happen, not in any recent time, but it has. unless the change is a radical one then the spoiler effect will happen again and again and will deterr potential third party voters, reinforcing the "throw away" idea. unfortunately, not everyone will do what I say... yet... mwahahaaa.

It's happened before and it could happen again that a third party suddenly starts to win major elections. But the end result is simply that the third party becomes one of the two major parties, and one of the other two major parties disappears. The end result is that very little really changes except the names of the parties, and you still have a two party system, because that's what the math of the election system produces.

Quote from: Rafnul

"Bigotted Redneck" - Because he was born in Texas? That's racial profiling if I've ever heard it.



\*cough\* \*cough\*

As for bigoted, he's a bigot simply because he chooses to be. This has little to do with where he was born, raised, or went to college, and has everything to do with his personal choices and intollerant and narrow-minded beliefs.

Logged  
Rafnul!  
he-who-posts-lots  
Posts By Osmosis  
\*\*\*\*\*

Posts: 989

[View Profile](#)

Re: Who actually votes for bush?

« Reply #17 on: August 10, 2006, 11:26:20 AM »

Quote from: Rafnul! on August 10, 2006, 07:55:00 AM

"Bigotted Redneck" - Because he grew up in Texas? That's racial profiling if I've ever heard it.

What, have I shamelessly edited my own text once again?

Logged  
Big Boss  
Friggen Crazy  
Veritas Moderator  
Posts By Osmosis  
\*\*\*\*\*

Posts: 1456

Owner of 100000 V-Points

[View Profile WWW](#)

Re: Who actually votes for bush?

« Reply #18 on: August 10, 2006, 06:14:07 PM »

Quote

It's happened before and it could happen again that a third party suddenly starts to win major elections. But the end result is simply that the third party becomes one of the two major parties, and one of the other two major parties disappears. The end result is that very little really changes except the names of the parties, and you still have a two party system, because that's what the math of the election system produces.

yes, it's a cycle, just how the federalists sortof morphed into the democratic republicans which would eventually turn into the regular democrats and then throw in members of the populists parties and the bull moose party and whatever other party.

If a third party is elected, we'll have them in power, with THEIR beliefs intact for at least a few years, before the media and advertising gets to them. it's temporary, but it's like picking 10 years of something good instead of instant drama. and we're talking the drama that makes people sick.

Just read in the news that Bush called the would-be terrorists in this weeks airline plot to be "Islamic Fascists."

nice bush... nice.

Logged

Join my Folding@Home team and do some good! #159490

Details at <http://folding.stanford.edu/>

kakkarot

0. The Fool... Inverted?

Posts By Osmosis

\*\*\*\*\*

Posts: 2701

Pirate "Not-A-Mod" BoB

View Profile

Re: Who actually votes for bush?

« Reply #19 on: August 10, 2006, 07:37:45 PM »

Quote from: Rafnul! on August 10, 2006, 07:55:00 AM

"Bigotted Redneck" - Because he grew up in Texas? That's racial profiling if I've ever heard it.

so much wrong in so little words x\_x

kobko's coughing (\*gives kobok some cough drops\*) was pointing out bush was born in conneticut (i don't care if it's misspelt Tongue) and probably grew up their too. nextly, state has nothing to do with race. thirdly, racial profiling is what cops do to figure out what ethnic peoples are more likely to commit which crimes in which areas, and then focus a little more attention on those races when they do investigations after crimes (and before anyone gets "righteously upset", race is just ONE of the criteria of suspect profiling. it gets all the attention merely cause the media are whores).

~kakkarot

« Last Edit: August 10, 2006, 07:39:19 PM by kakkarot »      Logged  
Philippians 2:5 Your attitude should be the same as that of Christ Jesus: 6 Who, being  
in very nature God, did not consider equality with God something to be grasped, 7 but  
made himself nothing, taking the very nature of a servant, being made in human  
likeness.

Philosopher  
Veritas Furniture  
\*\*\*\*

Posts: 316

Bah.

[View Profile](#)

Re: Who actually votes for bush?

« Reply #20 on: August 11, 2006, 01:04:22 PM »

I'm very suspicious of democracy in its current form, partly because we are generally  
told to accept it as the best way to rule and never to question it.

But more importantly, because it is impossible for anyone to get elected who is in any  
way opposed to the status quo, elections cost money, a massive amount in the case of  
presidential/general elections, so in order to run you must have the backing of the rich  
upper middle class, if you do not espouse their values you will never get the backing  
necessary to win an election, which is why we see, particularly in England, the major  
parties fight for the same political ground. Until private backing is abolished and replaced  
by state funding democracy will not be democracy.

Logged  
SethLaRoth DeShawl  
Regular Member  
Posts By Osmosis  
\*\*\*\*\*

Posts: 877

[View Profile](#)

Re: Who actually votes for bush?

« Reply #21 on: August 11, 2006, 01:11:49 PM »

I simply said screw em both

(voted Nader)  
Logged

sethlaroth\_deshawl@dragonmount.com

Wil

Veritas Furniture

\*\*\*\*

Posts: 296

[View Profile](#)

Re: Who actually votes for bush?

« Reply #22 on: August 11, 2006, 03:40:00 PM »

Two words: Joe Lieberman. A 'Lieberal' (l-ee-ber-al). Supports the war but still has very democratic views in the other subjects. Sad that the democrats turned on one of their own -- one of the few Democrats who can think for themselves. It's ok though -- let's focus on the past.

Logged

Those who do not know speak, and those who do keep silent.

The Kingdom of God is within you, and all about you, not in buildings of wood and stone.

"the Most High does not dwell in temples made with hands" Acts 7:48

Emira

El Mira - The Sight

A Familiar Feature

\*\*\*

Posts: 150

Live. There is no plan B.

[View Profile](#)

Re: Who actually votes for bush?

« Reply #23 on: August 13, 2006, 12:33:38 AM »

Where I am most people voted for Bush because he lowered taxes. That said, many people are annoyed with him now because he didn't attempt to balance the budget or do any other sort of fiscally conservative things that many expected. Not that he ran on a platform involving that, it's just that he's a republican.

Another problem with third parties is that they can't always get their candidate on the ballot, the system for getting a candidate on the ballot is legally intensive and varies from state to state. Third parties sometimes can't get enough lawyers in every state to get their names on the ballot, whereas the two main parties have everything set up from

years gone by and whole teams to get these sorts of things done.

Logged

"The purpose of all the major religious traditions is not to construct big temples on the outside, but to create temples of goodness and compassion inside, in our hearts." –The 14th Dali Llama

[http://nobelprize.org/nobel\\_prizes/literature/laureates/1993/morrison-lecture.html](http://nobelprize.org/nobel_prizes/literature/laureates/1993/morrison-lecture.html)

Big Boss

Friggen Crazy

Veritas Moderator

Posts By Osmosis

\*\*\*\*\*

Posts: 1456

Owner of 100000 V-Points

[View Profile WWW](#)

Re: Who actually votes for bush?

« Reply #24 on: August 13, 2006, 06:06:19 AM »

Quote from: Emira on August 13, 2006, 12:33:38 AM

Where I am most people voted for Bush because he lowered taxes. That said, many people are annoyed with him now because he didn't attempt to balance the budget or do any other sort of fiscally conservative things that many expected. Not that he ran on a platfrom involving that, it's just that he's a republican.

Another problem with third parties is that they can't always get their candidate on the ballot, the system for getting a candidate on the ballot is legally intensive and varies from state to state. Third parties sometimes can't get enough lawyers in every state to get their names on the ballot, whereas the two main parties have everything set up from years gone by and whole teams to get these sorts of things done.

yes, that's a problem Nader had in a few states this last election when he tried running independent. To get national funding, 5% of votes need to be won, which he fell just short of. so, to get the money to get your name out, you need to have everybody know your name. delightful catch-22. anyway, even if he got the national funding, he'd still have to wait another four years to really employ it to really get known. I actually didn't think of this when I was saying to vote third party. hrm... well, I guess if you wanted to defeat the trend you could always look up the third party websites. everybody has a website these days. people just don't want to research nobody's it seems. \*sigh\* no solution...

Logged

Join my Folding@Home team and do some good! #159490

Details at <http://folding.stanford.edu/>

kobok

Veritas Council

Tech Team

Posts By Osmosis

\*\*\*\*\*

Posts: 3885

Veritas Council

View Profile

Re: Who actually votes for bush?

« Reply #25 on: August 13, 2006, 11:49:00 AM »

Quote from: Wil on August 11, 2006, 03:40:00 PM

Two words: Joe Lieberman. A 'Lieberal' (l-ee-ber-al). Supports the war but still has very democratic views in the other subjects. Sad that the democrats turned on one of their own -- one of the few Democrats who can think for themselves. It's ok though -- let's focus on the past.

Many politically active democrats right now believe that a politician who continues to support the war in Iraq has no moral character, and that this makes it an excellent test of fitness for leadership. If the world were just and fair, there would be war crimes trials over this war and the way it was executed, so support for this war is support FOR terror and war crimes.

Recent polling in the middle east has shown that we've lost our potency for negotiating peace in Lebanon because we have no credibility there after all of the citizens they've seen tortured and killed by us in Iraq. This is not at all helpful. Continuing the war continues to weaken our moral standing in that region, and makes us the hated enemy of the common people, rather than the savior of the oppressed.

As for Lieberman himself, he kept trying to support his war stance by quoting fallacious Bush rhetoric. He repeatedly equates the war in Iraq with 9/11 (which is false, and generally indicates racism against Arabs on the part of the speaker, with an "all arabs are the same" sort of belief), he tries to argue that reducing troop presence in Iraq will tell terrorists that they should attack after we leave (an argument which means we can never leave, because that argument would never go away), and he keeps trying to say that Lamont is a flip-flopper. Most democrats are a little tired of that rhetoric, and don't buy it any more when Lieberman says it than when Bush said it.

Concern over what these issues, approaches, and personality traits say about the issues Lieberman would support in the future were apparently enough impetus for Connecticut democrats to throw out an incumbent.

« Last Edit: August 13, 2006, 11:51:06 AM by kobok » Logged  
psi\_vamp  
A Veritas Regular  
\*\*

Posts: 71

ThE pRoUd FoUnDeR oF..... MEH!

[View Profile](#)

Re: Who actually votes for bush?

« Reply #26 on: August 13, 2006, 12:52:04 PM »

Why do we have to vote for anyone? Why cant we vote for the things that happen instead of letting some nobhead who cares more about golf and cheeseburgers choose? That would make a better place for us all. And as for my uk leader tony blair, dont even get me started!

Logged  
~terra

-----  
have you done your homework?.. MEH!  
have you made your bed?.. MEH!  
have you a reason for anything?... MEH!  
MEH! MEH! MEH! MEH! MEH!  
LET THE LEGACY OF MEH BEGINNNNN! MEH MEH MEH MEH  
2007  
Darkflame  
Frequent poster  
Posts By Osmosis  
\*\*\*\*\*  
Posts: 537

武礼久

[View Profile](#)

Re: Who actually votes for bush?

« Reply #27 on: August 13, 2006, 04:17:16 PM »

Quote from: psi\_vamp on August 13, 2006, 12:52:04 PM

Why do we have to vote for anyone? Why cant we vote for the things that happen instead of letting some nobhead who cares more about golf and cheeseburgers choose? That would make a better place for us all. And as for my uk leader tony blair, dont even get me started!

You would live at the polling booth and even less would get done.

Logged

<kobok> Link isn't wearing any pants.

<kobok> What sort of goblin porn is this?

<Prophecy> Darkflame: A swift punch to one of the eyes has marvellous results.

kobok

Veritas Council

Tech Team

Posts By Osmosis

\*\*\*\*\*

Posts: 3885

Veritas Council

[View Profile](#)

Re: Who actually votes for bush?

« Reply #28 on: August 13, 2006, 04:45:29 PM »

Quote from: psi\_vamp on August 13, 2006, 12:52:04 PM

Why do we have to vote for anyone? Why cant we vote for the things that happen instead of letting some nobhead who cares more about golf and cheeseburgers choose?

1. Democracy is slow. You need an executive branch to react quickly to invasions and emergencies. (This becomes dangerous though because of the concentrated power.)
2. Running a country is complicated and contains much detail. You need people who do this for a living, because you can't expect average people on the street to know enough about military equipment, road construction, and cancer research to know how much money to give to each. (This becomes problematic when the complexity exceeds the understanding of the lawmakers, and when the complexity is used to hide special interest actions from the people.)
3. Mob rule makes very bad decisions sometimes. It is good to have parts of the government like the Supreme Court which are slow to change to prevent popular atrocities. For a true democracy it is not enough to have majority rule. You must also have protection of the minority groups and viewpoints.

Logged

Lightbringer

Has a lot of posts

Posts By Osmosis

\*\*\*\*\*

Posts: 793



Spiritual Warrior

[View Profile](#)

Re: Who actually votes for bush?

« Reply #29 on: August 13, 2006, 11:39:25 PM »

Quote from: kobok on August 13, 2006, 11:49:00 AM

Recent polling in the middle east has shown that we've lost our potency for negotiating peace in Lebanon because we have no credibility there after all of the citizens they've seen tortured and killed by us in Iraq. This is not at all helpful. Continuing the war continues to weaken our moral standing in that region, and makes us the hated enemy of the common people, rather than the savior of the oppressed.

While I agree with you otherwise, I have a serious issue with this point. Hezbollah's mandate is to destroy Israel as we all know and Hezbollah was voted in by Lebanese (Christian and Muslim alike) with a 87% majority. The people voted in a terrorist group then rather than saying "Shit, I can't believe we voted those idiots in!" like many people are doing with Bush (not implying Bush is an idiot, that's simply what I hear quite often), they cheer Hezbollah on. We've all seen the footage of people screaming to kill Jews while driving to Syria in their cars with the yellow flag hanging out their windows. These people are not civilians, they're like Nazis that preferred to delegate the work at Auschwitz (sp?) to like-minded madmen simply because they don't want to dirty their hands. Now when the US (Israel's voice in the UN) tries to negotiate with Hezbollah or Lebanon at all, what do you EXPECT is going to happen? The Americans' credit with Lebanese has nothing to do with Iraq, it's that the Lebanese people are insane and bloodthirsty by their own choosing. Voting for Hezbollah meant voting for genocide and they all knew it. Now shit hits the fan and they blame Israel, the international community and the US for not getting an immediate ceasefire? Suck it up, buttercup...  
Logged

The thing that really fascinates me about people is their ability to have no idea what's going on even though it's going on in plain sight all around them and the even more amazing tendency to argue violently when one of these obvious things is presented to them.

Pages: 1 [2] 3 4 ... 6Print

« previous next »

Jump to:

=> Main Hall

Powered by MySQL Powered by PHP Powered by SMF 1.1.11 | SMF © 2006-2009,  
Simple Machines LLC

Oxygen design by Bloc Valid XHTML 1.0! Valid CSS!  
<http://forums.v society.net/index.php/topic%2C8854.30.html>

1 capture  
7 Jul 2010  
Jun JUL Aug  
07  
2009 2010 2011

About this capture  
The Veritas Society

\*

\*HomeForumsChatHelpSearchLoginRegister  
Welcome, Guest. Please login or register.  
Did you miss your activation email?  
July 07, 2010, 03:32:07 PM

Forever

Login with username, password and session length  
Search:

Advanced search

166556 Posts in 12245 Topics by 6539 Members - Latest Member: - VeritaSeraph  
Most online today: 82 - most online ever: 430 (June 28, 2007, 02:58:51 PM)

+ The Veritas Society

|-+ The Auditorium

| |-+ Main Hall

|| |-+ Who actually votes for bush? 0 Members and 1 Guest are viewing this topic.

« previous next »

Pages: 1 2 [3] 4 5 6 Print

Author Topic: Who actually votes for bush? (Read 5082 times)

kobok

Veritas Council

Tech Team

Posts By Osmosis

\*\*\*\*\*

Posts: 3885

Veritas Council

View Profile

Re: Who actually votes for bush?

« Reply #30 on: August 14, 2006, 12:13:11 PM »

Quote from: Lightbringer on August 13, 2006, 11:39:25 PM

Hezbollah's mandate is to destroy Israel as we all know and Hezbollah was voted in by Lebanese (Christian and Muslim alike) with a 87% majority. The people voted in a terrorist group then rather than saying "Shit, I can't believe we voted those idiots in!" like many people are doing with Bush (not implying Bush is an idiot, that's simply what I hear quite often), they cheer Hezbollah on. We've all seen the footage of people screaming to kill Jews while driving to Syria in their cars with the yellow flag hanging out their windows. These people are not civilians, they're like Nazis that preferred to delegate the work at Auschwitz (sp?) to like-minded madmen simply because they don't want to dirty their hands. Now when the US (Israel's voice in the UN) tries to negotiate with Hezbollah or Lebanon at all, what do you EXPECT is going to happen? The Americans' credit with Lebanese has nothing to do with Iraq, it's that the Lebanese people are insane and bloodthirsty by their own choosing. Voting for Hezbollah meant voting for genocide and they all knew it. Now shit hits the fan and they blame Israel, the international community and the US for not getting an immediate ceasefire? Suck it up, buttercup...

While the United States, Canadian, and Israeli governments consider Hezbollah a terrorist organization, the U.N. and most European governments do not. In most Arab countries, Hezbollah is considered a legitimate political party which started with a primary political platform of resisting the OCCUPATION of Lebanon BY Israel, which was ongoing and prolonged at the time of its forming. (For comparison, 50% of people in the U.S. believe Bush should be impeached, while only around 6% of people in Arab countries believe Hezbollah is a terrorist organization, while the vast majority believe it is a legitimate political party.) Only recently has most of Lebanon been out of occupation (although some argue that some of it was still under occupation, and there are remaining issues about prisoners from the occupation). However, recently, a few members of the security wing of Hezbollah (separate from the political wing of Hezbollah, and not condoned by the Lebanese government) captured two Israeli soldiers near the border of Lebanon and Israel, either on the Lebanon side or the Israeli side, and attempted to negotiate for a release of prisoners held by Israel from its occupation of Lebanon.

If you want to see footage of people screaming that Arabs should be blown off the face of the Earth, you need only watch Fox News or catch some on-the-streets-of-the-US footage on the internet. Is it any surprise you can find some of the same for Israelis in Lebanon after decades of Israeli occupation? This alone is not a basis for an argument, unless the argument is that you can find bloodthirsty and ignorant people in any population.

The Israeli justice minister has declared that ALL civilians in South Lebanon are terrorists, and thus subject to attack. I think it's pretty tough for Israel to claim a moral highground there. This would be like China and Russia declaring that everyone who lives south of the Mason Dixon line in the U.S. is a supporter of the Republicans and is

a terrorist, and then intentionally targetting civilians in the south of the U.S. If that happened, we would immediately declare the country attacking to be a terrorist state guilty of warcrimes.

(Note that I'm not trying to argue for the innocence of the security wing of Hezbollah here, as clearly civilians have been struck by rockets fired by the security wing of Hezbollah. While they claim this is retaliatory, it is still as inexcusable as when Israel does it. But I am arguing that there are more guilty parties than you are acknowledging, and specifically, that there are people in Israel whose behavior and actions must change to rectify this situation. I am also arguing that the civilians in Lebanon are largely victims, and not deserving of being killed as you implied.)

« Last Edit: August 14, 2006, 12:24:48 PM by kobok » Logged

Zake

Veritas Staff

Veritas Moderator

Posts By Osmosis

\*\*\*\*\*

Posts: 1722

Veritas Staff

[View Profile](#)

Re: Who actually votes for bush?

« Reply #31 on: August 14, 2006, 05:07:06 PM »

In Israel's (rather weak) defense, of course, they did give the Lebanese people some time to evacuate the south. Not like thats going to work any better than New Orleans, obviously. The theory that Israel apparently likes to hold is that the destruction caused by the retaliation against Hezbollah's actions will make the Lebanese force Hezbollah to disband for the sake of national security- which ignores several factors, such as that Lebanon could hardly force Hezbollah to disband if it wanted to, the group effectively belongs to Iran and/or Syria regardless, and so far the popular Lebanese blame for the destruction has been placed, with much justification, in Israel itself- which will in all likelihood vastly increase the popular support of Hezbollah. The recent ceasefire (which included stationing Lebanese troops and U.N. peacekeepers in southern Lebanon, for what its worth) would be nice if it held- but at this point, Hezbollah militants probably have far more to gain by firing more of those rockets, regardless of what it does to Lebanon. Even if that wasn't the case, it doesn't seem like most violent extremist groups have such good control over their constituents as to maintain a ceasefire. And, furthermore, the ceasefire agreement fails to do anything as useful as actually calling for the disbandment of Hezbollah (although, that may have been a wise move, simply for the sake of getting a ceasefire agreed upon).

Regardless, the point of this amateurish analysis is that the problem is just stupid bad,

and that the atrocious stink which surrounds the U.S.'s international politics nowadays doesn't have much impact either way. Even Clinton (who was, to avoid unnecessary debate, at the very least a better president) couldn't negotiate peace in the middle east, under less circumstances of less tension and violence, and with somewhat more cooperative agents. The entire region is more or less inherently instable. Civilians in Lebanon are themselves innocent, obviously, and so are those in Israel- but the pervailing attitudes (bloodthirst and ignorance) lead to conflict. The ceasefire that has been negotiated is as much as could be expected, at this point. Of all the things we can blame Bush for, failing to solve this problem isn't one of them.

Which isn't to say that he couldn't have done better than just declaring victory and forgetting about it.

Logged

Act; for the universe will never forget your movement, nor will it ever forgive your stillness.

Lightbringer

Has a lot of posts

Posts By Osmosis

\*\*\*\*\*

Posts: 793

Spiritual Warrior

[View Profile](#)

Re: Who actually votes for bush?

« Reply #32 on: August 14, 2006, 06:15:00 PM »

Quote from: kobok on August 14, 2006, 12:13:11 PM

While the United States, Canadian, and Israeli governments consider Hezbollah a terrorist organization, the U.N. and most European governments do not. In most Arab countries, Hezbollah is considered a legitimate political party which started with a primary political platform of resisting the OCCUPATION of Lebanon BY Israel, which was ongoing and prolonged at the time of its forming.

Let's not forget that the occupation of Lebanon was a direct result of cross border attacks. Lebanon just keeps doing what the rest of the Arab world has: starting fights with Israel they can't finish then they gripe that Israel attacks them back. Since when are nations expected to be attacked and do nothing in response? It seems the current (yet ridiculous) expectation especially being imposed on Israel.

Quote from: kobok on August 14, 2006, 12:13:11 PM

(For comparison, 50% of people in the U.S. believe Bush should be impeached, while only around 6% of people in Arab countries believe Hezbollah is a terrorist organization, while the vast majority believe it is a legitimate political party.) Only recently has most

of Lebanon been out of occupation (although some argue that some of it was still under occupation, and there are remaining issues about prisoners from the occupation).

It is as though the affliction of anti-Western and anti-Israeli insanity is shared by the majority of the Arab world...

Quote from: kobok on August 14, 2006, 12:13:11 PM

If you want to see footage of people screaming that Arabs should be blown off the face of the Earth, you need only watch Fox News or catch some on-the-streets-of-the-US footage on the internet.

I agree there are racists, bigots, neo-nazis and all other manner of extremists everywhere. But they don't make up 87% of the US population. Not bloody nearly.

Quote from: kobok on August 14, 2006, 12:13:11 PM

The Israeli justice minister has declared that ALL civilians in South Lebanon are terrorists, and thus subject to attack. I think it's pretty tough for Israel to claim a moral highground there. This would be like China and Russia declaring that everyone who lives south of the Mason Dixon line in the U.S. is a supporter of the Republicans and is a terrorist, and then intentionally targetting civilians in the south of the U.S. If that happened, we would immediately declare the country attacking to be a terrorist state guilty of warcrimes.

Declaring all civilians as terrorists doesn't mean that Israelis are targetting civilians, but simply means that they've had their chance to get out of the area. (The death toll would skyrocket if Israel targetted civilians because they have satellite feeds in their operational HQs that can see human beings through several building floors. Not to mention a few people sitting in their living rooms are worth the ordinance and other resources.) To stay means a "civilian" must be one of four things:

- 1) An active Hezbollah fighter
- 2) A Hezbollah reserves member
- 3) Unable to get out (and we're talking people who are physically incapable of getting out themselves and were left behind for whatever reason)
- 4) Too stupid or arrogant to understand the situation they're putting themselves in

Now 1 and 2 are obviously legitimate targets. The third group is a truly unfortunate loss but the number of people in this group is maybe in the hundreds in all of the south of Lebanon. Group 4 is the majority from the numbers I've seen and frankly I have no sympathy for such people. For example, if you are a white supremacist, to choose to be that is your human right but running through the Apollo shouting white supremacist propoganda is another thing entirely. The consequences of which are predictable and easily avoidable. Israel should not be held accountable for the deaths of these people, nor should they be referred to as civilians.

On a related note, civilian deaths have been greatly exaggerated in Lebanon due to

Hezbollah reporting the deaths of Hezbollah fighters as "civilian deaths" as well as Hezbollah going so far as to dig up bodies from Lebanese graveyards then placing them at the site of Israeli strikes. This was first discovered at Qana when the press got to the site in a matter of hours after the strike only to find some bodies were far too decayed to have been killed by the strike.

Quote from: kobok on August 14, 2006, 12:13:11 PM

(Note that I'm not trying to argue for the innocence of the security wing of Hezbollah here, as clearly civilians have been struckards by rockets fired by the security wing of Hezbollah. While they claim this is retaliatory, it is still as inexcusable as when Israel does it. But I am arguing that there are more guilty parties than you are acknowledging, and specifically, that there are people in Israel whose behavior and actions must change to rectify this situation. I am also arguing that the civilians in Lebanon are largely victims, and not deserving of being killed as you implied.)

While I understand your desire to maintain neutrality and look for faults on both sides of the conflict, I do not share it. Seeking neutrality and objectivity are two very different things and I personally prefer to right than neutral.

Logged

The thing that really fascinates me about people is their ability to have no idea what's going on even though it's going on in plain sight all around them and the even more amazing tendency to argue violently when one of these obvious things is presented to them.

kobok

Veritas Council

Tech Team

Posts By Osmosis

\*\*\*\*\*

Posts: 3885

Veritas Council

[View Profile](#)

Re: Who actually votes for bush?

« Reply #33 on: August 14, 2006, 08:44:33 PM »

Quote from: Lightbringer on August 14, 2006, 06:15:00 PM

Since when are nations expected to be attacked and do nothing in response?

Since the first day they truly want peace.

Group A attacks Group B because it was attacked yesterday/last month.

Group B attacks Group A because it was attacked yesterday/last month.

So long as both Group A and Group B believe that they must retaliate when attacked, the fighting will be perpetual. This is simple logic, and it is why peace has not been achieved. Everyone in the middle east is riding on an unstable equilibrium of disproportionate response against representative groups. If your philosophy promotes this, then your philosophy promotes perpetual violence.

It warrants saying that there are many effective things which can be done about attacks which do not involve attacking citizens of another country. One can, for example, engage in special forces operations to decimate specific operatives who are engaging in attacks. One can also proceed with tactics used in criminal investigations. One could go after a terrorist the same way one would go after a serial killer.

Quote from: Lightbringer on August 14, 2006, 06:15:00 PM

- 3) Unable to get out (and we're talking people who are physically incapable of getting out themselves and were left behind for whatever reason)
- 4) Too stupid or arrogant to understand the situation they're putting themselves in

Now 1 and 2 are obviously legitimate targets. The third group is a truly unfortunate loss but the number of people in this group is maybe in the hundreds in all of the south of Lebanon. Group 4 is the majority from the numbers I've seen and frankly I have no sympathy for such people.

Frankly, I would probably put the majority in group 3 of financially unable to get themselves out. Think of how many people didn't have financial means to leave New Orleans, in the wealthiest country on the planet, and then imagine telling people to leave South Lebanon of their own means or be labeled a terrorist. It's patently ridiculous.

And I don't think it's fair at all to call the remainder "stupid" or "arrogant". If someone in the government of some other country which everyone around you calls a terrorist state, tells you to pack up and abandon the home you've lived in your entire life, would you be "stupid" or "arrogant" to stay put?

Logged  
Lightbringer  
Has a lot of posts  
Posts By Osmosis

\*\*\*\*\*

Posts: 793

Spiritual Warrior

[View Profile](#)



Re: Who actually votes for bush?

« Reply #34 on: August 15, 2006, 04:58:33 PM »

Quote from: kobok on August 14, 2006, 08:44:33 PM

Quote from: Lightbringer on August 14, 2006, 06:15:00 PM

Since when are nations expected to be attacked and do nothing in response?

Since the first day they truly want peace.

Group A attacks Group B because it was attacked yesterday/last month.

Group B attacks Group A because it was attacked yesterday/last month.

So long as both Group A and Group B believe that they must retaliate when attacked, the fighting will be perpetual. This is simple logic, and it is why peace has not been achieved. Everyone in the middle east is riding on an unstable equilibrium of disproportionate response against representative groups. If your philosophy promotes this, then your philosophy promotes perpetual violence.

Your argument assumes both sides have unlimited resources and will to fight. If both sides even lasts long enough that a few generations have lived in perpetual war, their will to fight will dissolve. That is of course assuming one side is not simply wiped out due to depletion of resources (armaments, fuel, medical supplies, food, water, construction equipment, expertise or human lives). Ceasefires and anything other than total war (where the only body count that matters is how many soldiers you and your enemies have left) lead only to constant fighting scattered with periods of restocking and rearmament. No gun has an endless magazine, no army has endless morale. Only by constantly draining the armaments and determination of soldiers can a desire/ability to make war be lost. Like Bush said, a lasting and effective peace that eliminates the ability to continue fighting is preferable to an immediate ceasefire. No doubt you can now understand why I would vote for him in a heartbeat.

Quote from: kobok on August 14, 2006, 08:44:33 PM

It warrants saying that there are many effective things which can be done about attacks which do not involve attacking citizens of another country. One can, for example, engage in special forces operations to decimate specific operatives who are engaging in attacks. One can also procede with tactics used in criminal investigations. One could go after a terrorist the same way one would go after a serial killer.

Quote from: kobok on August 14, 2006, 08:44:33 PM

Frankly, I would probably put the majority in group 3 of financially unable to get themselves out. Think of how many people didn't have financial means to leave New Orleans, in the wealthiest country on the planet, and then imagine telling people to leave South Lebanon of their own means or be labeled a terrorist. It's patently ridiculous.

And I don't think it's fair at all to call the remainder "stupid" or "arrogant". If someone in

the government of some other country which everyone around you calls a terrorist state, tells you to pack up and abandon the home you've lived in your entire life, would you be "stupid" or "arrogant" to stay put?

Financially unable to get out? South Lebanon is about 30 km at the widest point. Thus the Syrian border is easily in walking distance and which is why the majority of a million refugees from Lebanon entered Syria on foot. Sure, it's no cakewalk but weighing the options of becoming a target for Israeli strikes or getting dehydrated and hungry from the journey to Syria provide an obvious answer of what to decide. Thus the issue is whether someone is PHYSICALLY unable to get out of Lebanon, not financially unable.

I'd choose to be homeless and alive than dead and still likely homeless because the very home I would be hiding in would be hit in the same strike that would kill me. To make any other choice for the sake of personal history in an area is indeed stupid. To make that improper choice because I believed I would not be killed, would not starve due to food shortages, etc. would be arrogant.

Logged

The thing that really fascinates me about people is their ability to have no idea what's going on even though it's going on in plain sight all around them and the even more amazing tendency to argue violently when one of these obvious things is presented to them.

kobok

Veritas Council

Tech Team

Posts By Osmosis

\*\*\*\*\*

Posts: 3885

Veritas Council

[View Profile](#)

Re: Who actually votes for bush?

« Reply #35 on: August 15, 2006, 09:51:28 PM »

Quote from: Lightbringer on August 15, 2006, 04:58:33 PM

Like Bush said, a lasting and effective peace that eliminates the ability to continue fighting is preferable to an immediate ceasefire. No doubt you can now understand why I would vote for him in a heartbeat.

Since no one has any intention (or perhaps even means) of surrendering, there are essentially only two methods of achieving a lasting and real peace in that region:

1. Cultural change in the region.
2. Killing everybody on one side.

The first one cannot be meaningfully achieved while fighting continues. Bush's strategy seems to be the second one. He justifies this to himself by saying that everyone who fights against whatever side he has chosen is pure evil. I personally don't consider a plan of killing everybody to be a very noble strategy.

Quote from: Lightbringer on August 15, 2006, 04:58:33 PM

I'd choose to be homeless and alive than dead and still likely homeless because the very home I would be hiding in would be hit in the same strike that would kill me. To make any other choice for the sake of personal history in an area is indeed stupid. To make that improper choice because I believed I would not be killed, would not starve due to food shortages, etc. would be arrogant.

If Osama Bin Laden announced that everyone in the U.S. is a target and would be subject to attack if they didn't leave the U.S., would you leave? When you understand that analogy, you will understand how ridiculous your statement is.

It's not fair to hold a double standard by expecting something of the others that you wouldn't do yourself if it happened to you and your people.

Logged  
Lightbringer  
Has a lot of posts  
Posts By Osmosis  
\*\*\*\*\*

Posts: 793

Spiritual Warrior

[View Profile](#)

Re: Who actually votes for bush?

« Reply #36 on: August 15, 2006, 10:28:41 PM »

Quote from: kobok on August 15, 2006, 09:51:28 PM

Since no one has any intention (or perhaps even means) of surrendering, there are essentially only two methods of achieving a lasting and real peace in that region:

1. Cultural change in the region.
2. Killing everybody on one side.

The first one cannot be meaningfully achieved while fighting continues. Bush's strategy seems to be the second one. He justifies this to himself by saying that everyone who fights against whatever side he has chosen is pure evil. I personally don't consider a

plan of killing everybody to be a very noble strategy.

I believe Bush speaks differently from what he thinks because troops' morale and PR are very important. It's easier to kill the opposition if they are viewed as less human, less good. It's a manipulation of the fragile state people in the 1st world exist in. They are learning about peace, compassion and many other such enlightening things but they are stuck in a world where not everyone shares that level of emotional, spiritual and mental development. Most first worlders can not relate to the tribalism, cruelty, ruthlessness and harshness much of the world has yet to grow out of so when they must face such enemies, they must be manipulated so their resolve does not crumble. I agree that killing is far from noble but that does not mean it is not necessary at times. One can not dogmatically follow their ideals when the world around them is not ideal, especially when refusing to make a few compromises causes an endless cycle of death.

Also, you've decided that two nations at war can't decide to end a war because the fighting is seen as no longer worth the cost (for reasons of resources, loss of resolve, new generations sick of war have come and gone) and thus you've arbitrarily said option one is not possible. I've been arguing to the counter by saying that nonstop fighting does wear down the nations' ability and desire to kill each other. It seems odd you'd just ignore the point and decide it is invalid without any justification when I've repeatedly turned your attention to it.

Quote from: kobok on August 15, 2006, 09:51:28 PM

If Osama Bin Laden announced that everyone in the U.S. is a target and would be subject to attack if they didn't leave the U.S., would you leave? When you understand that analogy, you will understand how ridiculous your statement is.

It's not fair to hold a double standard by expecting something of the others that you wouldn't do yourself if it happened to you and your people.

But now you've changed the format of the question. In your first version of this question, I was not a willing supporter of the organization declared as terrorists by another nation. Thus to escape being lumped together with the terrorists as just another target, I would choose to flee. This scenario also implied that the enemy had the capabilities to target many many people, as the Israelis do when facing South Lebanon.

Now you ask if I would flee from the US because some terrorist would attack my home. Now the capability of a terrorist organization such as Al Qaeda is not so gargantuan that they could run through the US so already the question is different. This 2nd version also involves me being a member of a nation whose sole mandate is not to annihilate another nation but have actually taken it upon themselves to be a police force and mediator in world affairs. So would I stick with a nation with noble intentions albeit a little misguided (I do not believe "policing" nor negotiating between 2 nations who won't talk to each other is useful because you simply can't save nations who want to kill their enemies more than they want peace) under the threat that somewhere, sometime,

maybe there will be a terror attack? Sure would. Would I flee from a country about to be destroyed by a powerful enemy who was lashing out against an organization from (and controlling much of) my country that was bent on killing them? Yup, I'd be gone in no time.

I fail to see how two so very different questions imply a double standard.

Logged

The thing that really fascinates me about people is their ability to have no idea what's going on even though it's going on in plain sight all around them and the even more amazing tendency to argue violently when one of these obvious things is presented to them.

kobok

Veritas Council

Tech Team

Posts By Osmosis

\*\*\*\*\*

Posts: 3885

Veritas Council

[View Profile](#)

Re: Who actually votes for bush?

« Reply #37 on: August 16, 2006, 12:34:14 AM »

Quote from: Lightbringer on August 15, 2006, 10:28:41 PM

It's easier to kill the opposition if they are viewed as less human, less good.

It's easier to kill people, yes. But it makes it an awful lot harder to win the war of ideas which we are actually fighting, and losing.

Quote from: Lightbringer on August 15, 2006, 10:28:41 PM

They are learning about peace, compassion and many other such enlightening things but they are stuck in a world where not everyone shares that level of emotional, spiritual and mental development.

So those are enlightened and spiritually developed first-world peace missiles and compassion clusters that are blowing up those poor unknowing third worlders?

Rent this movie, and watch the massacres in there for a little perspective on what the enlightened first world looks like from the pointy end of a gun.

.

Quote from: Lightbringer on August 15, 2006, 10:28:41 PM

Also, you've decided that two nations at war can't decide to end a war because the

fighting is seem as no longer worth the cost (for reasons of resources, loss of resolve, new generations sick of war have come and gone) and thus you've arbitrarily said option one is not possible. I've been arguing to the counter by saying that nonstop fighting does wear down the nations' ability and desire to kill eachother. It seems odd you'd just ignore the point and decide it is invalid without any justification when I've repeatedly turned your attention to it.

Call it a crazy hunch, but I think that if the middle east was going to get tired of fighting, and just stop, they probably would have done that by now. The cable news outlets in the U.S. may be calling this "Day 20" or whatever count they are up to now, but to the people over there, this has been going on for decades.

Quote from: Lightbringer on August 15, 2006, 10:28:41 PM

Now you ask if I would flee from the US because some terrorist would attack my home. Now the capability of a terrorist organization such as Al Qaeda is not so gargantuan that they could run through the US so already the question is different. This 2nd version also involves me being a member of a nation whose sole mandate is not to annihilate another nation but have actually taken it upon themselves to be a police force and mediator in world affairs. So would I stick with a nation with noble intentions albeit a little misguided (I do not believe "policing" nor negotiating between 2 nations who won't talk to each other is useful because you simply can't save nations who want to kill their enemies more than they want peace) under the threat that somewhere, sometime, maybe there will be a terror attack? Sure would. Would I flee from a country about to be destroyed by a powerful enemy who was lashing out against an organization from (and controlling much of) my country that was bent on killing them? Yup, I'd be gone in no time.

I fail to see how two so very different questions imply a double standard.

So you think people should stay in the U.S. because it has noble intentions and is powerful, but you think people should leave Lebanon because it has evil intentions, and is weak. And you fail to see how that's a double standard?

There are people in south Lebanon supporting Hezbollah today because after 2 decades of occupation (from a war started by Israel), Hezbollah was the only organization they saw standing up for the people of Lebanon, while the Israelis were essentially seen as occupiers who were actively suppressing the Lebanese people that entire time. So Israelis are other people who come into Lebanon, point guns at the Lebanese, shoot their neighbors, and blow up their homes. Hezbollah, in comparison, is a political party which runs hospitals, runs schools, organizes economic development, organizes infrastructure construction, and provides relief for humanitarian disasters in Lebanon. This is what the Lebanese people see on their streets, and it'd be pretty damn tough for a western reporter in an air conditioned office in the U.S. to try to convince them that Hezbollah is a terrorist organization and Israel is a country with noble intentions, when direct experience has shown them the opposite in a very powerful way. If you don't understand that, then you're not trying hard enough to

visualize the daily experience of an ordinary upstanding Lebanese citizen.

Logged

kakkarot

0. The Fool... Inverted?

Posts By Osmosis

\*\*\*\*\*

Posts: 2701

Pirate "Not-A-Mod" BoB

[View Profile](#)

Re: Who actually votes for bush?

« Reply #38 on: August 16, 2006, 09:28:46 AM »

I'm still waiting for the day when the US says that Canada is harbouring too many terrorists that are linked to Al-Qaeda and that we're not only not doing enough to catch them, but we might even supposedly be helping them. Thus giving the US an excuse to invade a G8 country and shock the world as it quietly takes over Alberta's oilsands and sells them to Bush's business partners... they've been subtly alluding to this possible path of action for a while now by continually remarking on Canada's supposed inactivity regarding terrorist activities.

or maybe that's just me ^\_^

~kakkarot

Logged

Philippians 2:5 Your attitude should be the same as that of Christ Jesus: 6 Who, being in very nature God, did not consider equality with God something to be grasped, 7 but made himself nothing, taking the very nature of a servant, being made in human likeness.

psi\_vamp

A Veritas Regular

\*\*

Posts: 71

ThE pRoUd FoUnDeR oF..... MEH!

[View Profile](#)

Re: Who actually votes for bush?

« Reply #39 on: August 16, 2006, 10:13:49 AM »

No kakarot thats true. Lol i bet bush will try and take russia next then we'll all be fucked

because there would be a nuclear war. I think bush wants world domination, as crazy as it may seem. And we all know that the voting is rigged so that he wins and gets power. I dont know why people look up to a president that is so stupid that he cant even read a kiddies book! Then when 9/11 happned, he just sat there. People say he was in shock, but he wasnt. He just didnt have any advisors or ear pieces that told him what to do and say.

Logged  
~terra

-----  
have you done your homework?.. MEH!  
have you made your bed?.. MEH!  
have you a reason for anything?... MEH!  
MEH! MEH! MEH! MEH! MEH!  
LET THE LEGACY OF MEH BEGINNNNN! MEH MEH MEH MEH  
2007

Lightbringer  
Has a lot of posts  
Posts By Osmosis  
\*\*\*\*\*

Posts: 793

Spiritual Warrior

[View Profile](#)

Re: Who actually votes for bush?

« Reply #40 on: August 16, 2006, 09:23:13 PM »

Quote from: kobok on August 16, 2006, 12:34:14 AM

It's easier to kill people, yes. But it makes it an awful lot harder to win the war of ideas which we are actually fighting, and losing.

The "war of ideas" was never winnable. Dogma can not be destroyed any way other than from within a religious community and destruction of warmongering dogma is exactly what is required before peace in the Middle East can happen. However it will never in a million years occur because WE tell them their thinking is wrong. They need to decide whether that happens for themselves and only a wearing down of resolve (by constantly fighting for whatever justification was originally used) will cause that change from within.

Quote from: kobok on August 16, 2006, 12:34:14 AM

So those are enlightened and spiritually developed first-world peace missiles and compassion clusters that are blowing up those poor unknowing third worlders?

I've stated exactly the opposite. The residents of the first world live a relatively cushy



and comfy existence and so they are not used to facing the harshness of the rest of the world. Thus when a first world army is forced to exist in those harsh areas of the world (in their harshest times of war and massacre) they must be lied to or they're simply useless as an army. War is terrible, ruthless and violent. You'll get no argument from me.

Quote from: kobok on August 16, 2006, 12:34:14 AM

Call it a crazy hunch, but I think that if the middle east was going to get tired of fighting, and just stop, they probably would have done that by now. The cable news outlets in the U.S. may be calling this "Day 20" or whatever count they are up to now, but to the people over there, this has been going on for decades.

They've been warring for far longer than decades (although not always with Israel but rather with each other before Israel was created). They've been tribal for thousands of years but learning the lessons that war has to offer does not happen simply because a nation has "paid their dues" in a currency of "years of warring and unrest". An effort towards progress must be made from within and then peace will be the natural result. You're thinking too small right now and it's causing you to overlook the bigger picture. Yes, it's unfortunate that people must die so that a civilization must learn lessons to forward their development, but every first world nation went through the exact same thing. We're not doing too poorly now given our equally violent histories. Smiley

Quote from: kobok on August 16, 2006, 12:34:14 AM

So you think people should stay in the U.S. because it has noble intentions and is powerful, but you think people should leave Lebanon because it has evil intentions, and is weak. And you fail to see how that's a double standard?

A double standard would be saying that only women and not men could work as secretaries, for example. The phrase "double standard" implies injustice to one side because both genders can be proficient at secretary work. Defining between good and evil, malevolent and compassionate, and choosing a side is not a double standard. If a man asked for your help, would you treat a repeat-offending murderer to the same hospitality you would treat a known volunteer in the community? No, because the two are not simply 2 equal people in every respect that matters in this situation. One has an established "goodness" while the other does not.

Quote from: kobok on August 16, 2006, 12:34:14 AM

There are people in south Lebanon supporting Hezbollah today because after 2 decades of occupation (from a war started by Israel), Hezbollah was the only organization they saw standing up for the people of Lebanon, while the Israelis were essentially seen as occupiers who were actively suppressing the Lebanese people that entire time. So Israelis are other people who come into Lebanon, point guns at the Lebanese, shoot their neighbors, and blow up their homes. Hezbollah, in comparison, is a political party which runs hospitals, runs schools, organizes economic development, organizes infrastructure construction, and provides relief for humanitarian disasters in Lebanon. This is what the Lebanese people see on their streets, and it'd be pretty

damn tough for a western reporter in an air conditioned office in the U.S. to try to convince them that Hezbollah is a terrorist organization and Israel is a country with noble intentions, when direct experience has shown them the opposite in a very powerful way. If you don't understand that, then you're not trying hard enough to visualize the daily experience of an ordinary upstanding Lebanese citizen.

I do not doubt that is what some of them see, but they also see the truly malevolent side of Hezbollah and do nothing. People have time and time again sold their souls to madmen in exchange for a wealth, power, revenge, etc. Hezbollah does indeed support the people of south Lebanon in many ways, but does that mean they can do whatever they like and take on irresponsible policies like calling for the destruction of another nation? The current situation in Lebanon is so very reminiscent of Germany after WWI. Hitler comes in, improves the economy through military mobilization and becomes chancellor where he is allowed to romp through most of Europe and parts of Asia and Africa before being stopped. Only 3% of Germans were card carrying Nazis in those days but the rest of Germany did nothing to stop a madman because they were too fixated on reaping the short term benefits of becoming a war machine. Should Lebanon be so quick to repeat that same mistake? Of course, rather than trading in exchange for wealth, they'll merely get a chance to kill some Israelis. A poor deal for all involved...

Quote from: kakkarot on August 16, 2006, 09:28:46 AM

I'm still waiting for the day when the US says that Canada is harbouring too many terrorists that are linked to Al-Qaeda and that we're not only not doing enough to catch them, but we might even supposedly be helping them.

Actually, before Harper was elected, we sent millions a year to Hezbollah, Hamas and other terrorist organizations under the Liberals. And it's often easier for terrorists to create bombs in Canada then travel across the borders at areas where customs is less effective. The ferry from Victoria, BC to Port Angeles, Washington is one such place. Last year two men did sneak a large bomb to Washington in the trunk of their car by taking the ferry and were only caught for speeding in Washington, not by customs officials. So your sarcasm was actually quite correct lol.

As for the invasion of Canada, I'm going to simply say that's laughable since Harper is more conservative than many Republicans now lol. Why get rid of an agreeable ally?

« Last Edit: August 16, 2006, 09:29:32 PM by Lightbringer » Logged

The thing that really fascinates me about people is their ability to have no idea what's going on even though it's going on in plain sight all around them and the even more amazing tendency to argue violently when one of these obvious things is presented to them.

TakeV

Don't be scared.

Veritas Moderator

Posts By Osmosis

\*\*\*\*\*

Posts: 847

[View Profile WWW](#)

Re: Who actually votes for bush?

« Reply #41 on: August 16, 2006, 10:24:39 PM »

Quote from: psi\_vamp on August 16, 2006, 10:13:49 AM

No kakarot thats true. Lol i bet bush will try and take russia next then we'll all be fucked because there would be a nuclear war. I think bush wants world domination, as crazy as it may seem. And we all know that the voting is rigged so that he wins and gets power. I dont know why people look up to a president that is so stupid that he cant even read a kiddies book! Then when 9/11 happned, he just sat there. People say he was in shock, but he wasnt. He just didnt have any advisors or ear pieces that told him what to do and say.

Bush is out of power in two years. Besides, with the US taking over both Canada and Russia, who the hell could be that, even with nukes?

(And, in a slightly related story, Oceania is america+canada+west europe. Have fun tumbling that around in your head)

Logged

Best argument ever.

kobok

Veritas Council

Tech Team

Posts By Osmosis

\*\*\*\*\*

Posts: 3885

[Veritas Council](#)

[View Profile](#)

Re: Who actually votes for bush?

« Reply #42 on: August 17, 2006, 01:12:57 AM »

Quote from: Lightbringer on August 16, 2006, 09:23:13 PM

Quote from: kobok on August 16, 2006, 12:34:14 AM

It's easier to kill people, yes. But it makes it an awful lot harder to win the war of ideas which we are actually fighting, and losing.

The "war of ideas" was never winnable.

Wars of ideas are won all the time. To win this war of ideas we need to act in a manner such that the majority citizens in the middle east will like us, encourage them to like and enjoy our culture, give them reason to respect us as a role model and desired state of existence, and provide them with a voice and support when they speak out about the problems with their governments.

Unfortunately, we've made enormous negative progress on this in the last 6 years. Imagine a world where, instead of invading Iraq, we had had a president starting in 2000 who took a firm stance with Israel and demanded that a legitimate Palestinian state be established promptly, and who had helped fund and organize reconstruction efforts in the new Palestinian state, including the construction of basic infrastructure, educational institutions, and a functioning economy. If this had happened, we would be winning the war on ideas, and we would be overwhelmingly respected by the citizens of the middle east, which would give us enormous power of negotiation and influence.

Quote from: Lightbringer on August 16, 2006, 09:23:13 PM

An effort towards progress must be made from within and then peace will be the natural result.

This is called a "war of ideas", and it's what we're losing. Efforts to create peace through cultural means in the middle east are substantially influenced by our actions.

Quote from: Lightbringer on August 16, 2006, 09:23:13 PM

Defining between good and evil, malevolent and compassionate, and choosing a side is not a double standard. ... One has an established "goodness" while the other does not.

You're missing the point. You are judging "goodness" and "evilness" by a double standard, just as a double standard in a court case would judge "guilt" or "innocence" by a double standard. You said "established", but your method of establishing it seems to carry with it the presumption of goodness and evilness in a cyclic reasoning pattern.

You say Hezbollah is evil because some of its members have called for the destruction of the government of Israel, but when the government of Israel calls for the destruction of Hezbollah, you call it good. There is no logic to that argument.

Logged  
solstice  
Dreamwalker  
Posts By Osmosis

\*\*\*\*\*

Posts: 2109

"Receive and transmit..."

[View Profile](#)

Re: Who actually votes for bush?

« Reply #43 on: August 17, 2006, 07:52:43 AM »

Quote

as far as I know that hasn't been a known problem. the congressman decide where the electoral votes go, but if they decide to give out votes against what the people voted for, there will be some complaining, and nail batting.

It's a problem, because Bush was put and kept in office. Enough said lol.

Raffy, you voted for him, didnt you? The Veritas Teethy!

Redneck:

In modern usage, the term redneck predominantly refers to a particular stereotype of individuals living in Appalachia, the Southern United States, the Ozarks, and later the Rocky Mountain States (Bush's current address is in Pennsylvania).

Usage of the term "Redneck" generally differs from Hick and Hillbilly, because Rednecks reject or resist assimilation into the dominant culture\*, while Hicks and Hillbillies theoretically are isolated from the dominant culture[1].

\*This is an interesting point.

Bush is notorious for his stubbornness. His current view on many issues reflect this attitude of rejection, and his disdain for values that are not his own. He is a bigot and a redneck.

« Last Edit: August 17, 2006, 07:57:24 AM by solstice »      Logged

Tell all the Truth but tell it slant: Success in Circuit lies. Too bright for our infirm Delight. The Truth's superb surprise. As Lightning to the Children eased, with explanation kind. The Truth must dazzle gradually, or every man be blind.

Tefeari: The Giant Impact Hypothesis is a theory

Lightbringer

Has a lot of posts

Posts By Osmosis

\*\*\*\*\*

Posts: 793

Spiritual Warrior

[View Profile](#)

Re: Who actually votes for bush?

« Reply #44 on: August 17, 2006, 12:43:12 PM »

Quote from: kobok on August 17, 2006, 01:12:57 AM

Wars of ideas are won all the time. To win this war of ideas we need to act in a

manner such that the majority citizens in the middle east will like us, encourage them to like and enjoy our culture, give them reason to respect us as a role model and desired state of existence, and provide them with a voice and support when they speak out about the problems with their governments.

Unfortunately, we've made enormous negative progress on this in the last 6 years. Imagine a world where, instead of invading Iraq, we had had a president starting in 2000 who took a firm stance with Israel and demanded that a legitimate Palestinian state be established promptly, and who had helped fund and organize reconstruction efforts in the new Palestinian state, including the construction of basic infrastructure, educational institutions, and a functioning economy. If this had happened, we would be winning the war on ideas, and we would be overwhelmingly respected by the citizens of the middle east, which would give us enormous power of negotiation and influence.

What wars of ideas are you talking about? Because arbitrarily expanding that classification to encompass anything that you can use as pseudo-support is not helping your point. That's like one kid saying "Did not!" and the other says "Did so!". No point is made because nothing backs up those statements. If you can come up with a war of ideas similar to the one going on in Lebanon that involves the challenging of the deepest beliefs of another culture in an attempt to end fighting, show me. Give me an example. But I highly doubt you'll be able to tell me something on the level of Indians managing to make Pakistanis feel they should just share Kashmir, or that Iran will stop trying to make nukes for the sake of the region's stability. The "war of ideas" in south Lebanon is not the same war of ideas that happens when two guys in a bar dispute which soccer team is better. There's more at stake and the beliefs are millions of times more deeply ingrained. Such wars can't be won by external forces.

Quote from: kobok on August 17, 2006, 01:12:57 AM

This is called a "war of ideas", and it's what we're losing. Efforts to create peace through cultural means in the middle east are substantially influenced by our actions.

But again you've missed a serious aspect of my point. Change from WITHIN implies no first world puppet masters/teachers/mediators/facilitators/etc. The Middle East resented us loooooong before Bush came into power and will continue to do so. We constantly demonstrate the benefits of a democratic, peaceful system by living our comfy lives. The facts are staring the undeveloped world in the face but they choose to blame all their flaws on other nations rather than look inwardly to further their development. Like a teenager who resents a parent, once the lesson has been taught, the parent can do no more. The teenager must CHOOSE to embrace or reject that lesson and live with that decision.

Quote from: kobok on August 17, 2006, 01:12:57 AM

You're missing the point. You are judging "goodness" and "evilness" by a double standard, just as a double standard in a court case would judge "guilt" or "innocence" by a double standard. You said "established", but your method of establishing it seems to carry with it the presumption of goodness and evilness in a cyclic reasoning pattern.

A double standard is judging a double standard? Perhaps you were in a hurry so feel free to retype that next response so that I'm not just assuming what you meant. However, I will attempt to address your point or my best guess of it. I am not judging by a double standard at all when I say something is good or evil. I am merely judging. To choose that distinction implies no double standard. To decide that one thing is better than another in a respect that both are equally good at doing (and then dealing with each in a different way regarding that respect) would be a double standard. So requiring that men do more schooling before being able to be secretaries as opposed to women would be a double standard.

Quote from: kobok on August 17, 2006, 01:12:57 AM

You say Hezbollah is evil because some of its members have called for the destruction of the government of Israel, but when the government of Israel calls for the destruction of Hezbollah, you call it good. There is no logic to that argument.

Yes, that logic is indeed lacking but you've inaccurately described the situation. You've left out a timeline. If one side simply calling for the destruction of the other at the same time was labelled good or bad based on favouritism, then that's indeed illogical and biased. But a timeline changes all that. The initial invasion of Lebanon was a response to unprovoked attacks by the PLO stationed in Lebanon as well as attacks my radical Lebanese groups still unhappy they were beaten in the last Arab-Israeli war. The Israelis responded once attacked. They then withdrew giving the Lebanese a chance at the freedom they so wanted. The Lebanese then decided to use that freedom to elect an anti-Israeli army of fanatical psychopaths. In that summarized account, the Lebanese had 2 chances in the last 30 years to stop the violence and they instead reignited it. They constantly kept placing their efforts in looking for ways to kill Israelis. Once you start a fight, you either stop it before it gets too far or the other side stops you. Thus the Israelis have had no other choice but to respond because they did not want to attack, and avoided attacking without grave need. The problem of judging who is bloodthirsty and who wants peace (I would not, and did not, say the Lebanese are evil) is not a challenging one to overcome. Once again, you've simply been confused by trying to remain neutral rather than objective.

Logged

The thing that really fascinates me about people is their ability to have no idea what's going on even though it's going on in plain sight all around them and the even more amazing tendency to argue violently when one of these obvious things is presented to them.

Pages: 1 2 [3] 4 5 6 Print

« previous next »

Jump to:

=> Main Hall

Oxygen design by Bloc    Valid XHTML 1.0! Valid CSS!  
<http://forums.vociety.net/index.php/topic%2C8854.75.html>

1 capture

07 Jul 2010

Jun    JUL    Aug

07

2009   2010   2011

About this capture  
The Veritas Society

\*

\*HomeForumsChatHelpSearchLoginRegister

Welcome, Guest. Please login or register.

Did you miss your activation email?

July 07, 2010, 03:35:15 PM

Forever

Login with username, password and session length

Search:

Advanced search

166556 Posts in 12245 Topics by 6539 Members - Latest Member: - VeritaSeraph

Most online today: 82 - most online ever: 430 (June 28, 2007, 02:58:51 PM)

+ The Veritas Society

| -+ The Auditorium

| | -+ Main Hall

| | | -+ Who actually votes for bush?    0 Members and 1 Guest are viewing this topic.

« previous next »

Pages: 1 ... 4 5 [6]    Print

Author    Topic: Who actually votes for bush?    (Read 5083 times)

kobok

Veritas Council

Tech Team

Posts By Osmosis

\*\*\*\*\*

Posts: 3885

Veritas Council



[View Profile](#)

Re: Who actually votes for bush?

« Reply #75 on: September 02, 2006, 07:33:43 PM »

Quote from: Rafnul! on September 02, 2006, 03:49:31 PM

Because kobok, as you and I both know, there is hatred on both sides. Nuclear weapons are the sad reason why in the lack of more rational and compassionate leadership in the region, Israel still exists. It's not as if Israel behaves completely justly... quite the contrary, but they act in the only manner they know of to survive. If they weren't severely overpowered, they would have already been wiped off the map. Clearly that's not a solution, but it's not as if "disarming Israel" would solve our problems either. Ultimately, our goal should be to have peace strong enough that Israel CAN disarm it's nuclear weapons.

Indeed, but Israel's neighbors don't feel like Israel stays within its borders, so their fear of survival is just as significant. But as we have been actively assisting one party due to closer cultural (mostly religious) ties, the status remains imbalanced.

My point in raising the issue of nuclear disarmament is not because I think there is any realistic chance of asking Israel to disarm its nuclear weapons without invading Israel, but it is to make the point more clear that we can't sit there and offer military support to one nation, while pretending to be a neutral party demanding disarmament from an enemy of that nation. It seems clear to me that nations such as Iran will feel quite morally justified to themselves to continue developing nuclear weapons regardless of anything we say, since we are supportive of Israel, their enemy, having nuclear weapons.

At least a pretense of disapproving of Israel's nuclear weapons, or some demonstration of true neutrality, would probably be a necessary prerequisite to being taken seriously when we try to tell Iran not to develop nuclear weapons.

Logged  
Biznut  
Greenhorn  
New Member  
\*

Posts: 17

Greenhorn

[View Profile](#)

Re: Who actually votes for bush?

« Reply #76 on: September 08, 2006, 10:17:16 AM »

Who actually lives in the USA?

Logged  
Vecna  
The Frosty Admin...  
Tech Team  
Posts By Osmosis  
\*\*\*\*\*  
Posts: 966

Heartless Admin and Lurker-In-Chief

[View Profile](#)

Re: Who actually votes for bush?  
« Reply #77 on: September 08, 2006, 01:05:24 PM »  
Quote from: Biznut on September 08, 2006, 10:17:16 AM  
Who actually lives in the USA?

Americas. Mostly.

~Crowley  
Logged

kobok  
Veritas Council  
Tech Team  
Posts By Osmosis  
\*\*\*\*\*  
Posts: 3885

Veritas Council

[View Profile](#)

Re: Who actually votes for bush?  
« Reply #78 on: September 08, 2006, 06:56:14 PM »  
Quote from: Biznut on September 08, 2006, 10:17:16 AM  
Who actually lives in the USA?

That's the sort of thing international travelers only confess to if followed by, "but I voted

for the other guy."

(In an interesting example of this, Americans with passports supported Kerry 58% to 35%. Of course only 20% of Americans own passports due to our geography and the fact that passports did not used to be necessary for travel to Canada or Mexico, and are never necessary inside the U.S. But it does indicate that those with increased contact with the outside world are much more anti-Bush. This is possibly also why Republicans organize with talk radio, and Democrats organize with internet blogs.)

Logged  
Lightbringer  
Has a lot of posts  
Posts By Osmosis  
\*\*\*\*\*

Posts: 793

Spiritual Warrior

[View Profile](#)

Re: Who actually votes for bush?

« Reply #79 on: September 09, 2006, 01:51:37 AM »

Kobok, you can't possibly know even the slightest about stats and claim that. Perhaps Kerry voters have more desire to travel. Maybe they've adopted that claim simply for the fact you outlined: any American who would claim they are American while in an anti-US country would say they voted for the other guy. There's plenty of reasons. Just because there is a correlation between Kerry voters and passports does not mean travel MADE them democrats. Correlation is not cause and effect.

Logged  
The thing that really fascinates me about people is their ability to have no idea what's going on even though it's going on in plain sight all around them and the even more amazing tendency to argue violently when one of these obvious things is presented to them.

kobok  
Veritas Council  
Tech Team  
Posts By Osmosis  
\*\*\*\*\*

Posts: 3885

Veritas Council

[View Profile](#)

Re: Who actually votes for bush?

« Reply #80 on: September 09, 2006, 01:06:36 PM »

Quote from: Lightbringer on September 09, 2006, 01:51:37 AM

Just because there is a correlation between Kerry voters and passports does not mean travel MADE them democrats.

Well, I didn't say "made". I in fact think the causal elements go in both directions. I think that social conservatives are less likely to seek interaction outside of a localized region, and I also think that people who experience a wider variety of cultures are more likely to be tolerant of these various cultures, which is a socially liberal trait and then nudges them toward this end of the political spectrum.

I would also presume that having a passport and traveling probably have less of an impact on economic viewpoints than on social viewpoints.

This tendency with conservatism and liberalism and travel is almost a necessity of the two philosophies. Social conservatism is essentially a preference for the dominance of a single culture, usually the one inherited from ones parents, which tends to be localized and regional. The social side of liberalism is essentially an acceptance of diversity of culture. Therefore the statistic presented is almost inevitable as long as social factors are a significant factor in choice of political party.

« Last Edit: September 09, 2006, 01:30:21 PM by kobok »      Logged

Pages: 1 ... 4 5 [6]    Print

« previous next »

Jump to:

=> Main Hall

Powered by MySQL Powered by PHP    Powered by SMF 1.1.11 | SMF © 2006-2009,  
Simple Machines LLC

Oxygen design by Bloc    Valid XHTML 1.0! Valid CSS!

<http://forums.v society.net/index.php?topic=8937.0>

4 captures

7 Jul 2010 - 17 Jul 2014

Sep    JUL    Aug

17

2011    2014    2015

About this capture

The Veritas Society

\*

\*HomeForumsChatHelpSearchRetroLoginRegister

Welcome, Guest. Please login or register.

Did you miss your activation email?  
July 17, 2014, 02:38:10 AM

Forever

Login with username, password and session length  
Search:

Advanced search

214929 Posts in 15321 Topics by 19763 Members - Latest Member: - ksyahu    Most  
online today: 103 - most online ever: 430 (June 28, 2007, 02:58:51 PM)

+ The Veritas Society

|-+ The Auditorium

||-+ Main Hall

|||-+ American Freedoms 1 - Bush 0    0 Members and 1 Guest are viewing this topic.

« previous next »

Pages: [1] 2 3    Print

Author    Topic: American Freedoms 1 - Bush 0    (Read 4500 times)

Big Boss

Friggen Crazy

Posts By Osmosis

\*\*\*\*\*

Posts: 1458

Karma: 3

Owner of 100000 V-Points

View Profile WWW

American Freedoms 1 - Bush 0

« on: August 18, 2006, 05:20:50 AM »

yeah, the title isn't completely accurate, but

[http://news.yahoo.com/s/ap/20060818/ap\\_on\\_re\\_us/warrantless\\_surveillance](http://news.yahoo.com/s/ap/20060818/ap_on_re_us/warrantless_surveillance)

Finally, somebody got the guts to rule against that unconstitutional crap (I'm not usually  
a politically fired up person, but I likes me some privacy.).

Lately I've been thinking. What's more terrifying than having someone tell you almost

every day that the middle east hates America and will stop at nothing to harm us all? I think this NSA program is just another terror tactic used to force (ease) us into submission.

If people don't start thinking on there own in the next 10 to 50 years, hopefully then they'll think about the Declaration of Independence and the right to a bloody revolution.

Logged

Join my Folding@Home team and do some good! #159490

Details at <http://folding.stanford.edu/>

kakkarot

0. The Fool... Inverted?

Posts By Osmosis

\*\*\*\*\*

Posts: 2701

Karma: 3

Pirate "Not-A-Mod" BoB

[View Profile](#)

Re: American Freedoms 1 - Bush 0

« Reply #1 on: August 18, 2006, 07:24:23 PM »

more like Bush 10, but still I think this is a good start for a hopefully better future.

~kakkarot

Logged

Philippians 2:5 Your attitude should be the same as that of Christ Jesus: 6 Who, being in very nature God, did not consider equality with God something to be grasped, 7 but made himself nothing, taking the very nature of a servant, being made in human likeness.

`Nazukarr

Posts By Osmosis

\*\*\*\*\*

Posts: 627

Karma: 15

[View Profile](#)

Re: American Freedoms 1 - Bush 0

« Reply #2 on: August 18, 2006, 07:47:19 PM »

Quote from: kakkarot on August 18, 2006, 07:24:23 PM

more like Bush 10, but still I think this is a good start for a hopefully better future.

~kakkarot

Agreed. I don't really don't do anything that would get me in trouble, so I don't worry, but I still think it's awesome that they ruled it as unconstitutional. From the information we were given from NSA program, it looked like Bush was stomping all over our rights. If he's gone through the proper channels, we sure as hell don't know, and it's unconstitutional until he 'reveals the state secrets'.

Logged

"I am not this hair, I am not this skin, I am the soul that lives within."

Big Boss

Friggen Crazy

Posts By Osmosis

\*\*\*\*\*

Posts: 1458

Karma: 3

Owner of 100000 V-Points

View Profile WWW

Re: American Freedoms 1 - Bush 0

« Reply #3 on: August 18, 2006, 10:42:21 PM »

I haven't done anything illegal in a very long time, but it's like, if I have nothing to hide, why do you insist on searching me? plus I think racial profiling is sick, and I bet anyone with a middle eastern background is being tapped non stop. course, those "state secrets" may not coincide with my suspicions. maybe we'll find out eventually.

Logged

Join my Folding@Home team and do some good! #159490

Details at <http://folding.stanford.edu/>

Rafnul!

he-who-posts-lots

Veritas Moderator

Posts By Osmosis

\*\*\*\*\*

Posts: 1081

Karma: 28

[View Profile](#)

Re: American Freedoms 1 - Bush 0

« Reply #4 on: August 19, 2006, 06:52:15 AM »

Quote from: Martial Thoughts on August 18, 2006, 10:42:21 PM

Lately I've been thinking. What's more terrifying than having someone tell you almost every day that the middle east hates America and will stop at nothing to harm us all? I think this NSA program is just another terror tactic used to force (ease) us into submission.

Well, that sounds kind of nice, except the the point of phone surveillance is to protect us from the thousands of people in the middle east who hate America and will stop at nothing to harm us all.

Logged

Faijer

Existential Pragmatist

Veritas Moderator

Posts By Osmosis

\*\*\*\*\*

Posts: 3201

Karma: 40

The Devil's Advocate

[View Profile WWW](#)

Re: American Freedoms 1 - Bush 0

« Reply #5 on: August 19, 2006, 08:18:11 AM »

Quote from: Martial Thoughts

if I have nothing to hide, why do you insist on searching me?

Because of course, anyone with something to hide is immediately a terrorist, and those who spurt out the words, "I have nothing to hide", are happy dancing little elves. Words are words, and you pay tax money for the protection the state gives, and searching people happens to be a part of that security given that weapons come in all shapes and sizes these days.

Logged



My WordPress Blog is updated regularly.

NEW UPDATE: Life begins at conception: A thought experiment (29/08/2012)

Philosopher

Veritas Furniture

\*\*\*\*

Posts: 316

Karma: 0

Bah.

[View Profile](#)

Re: American Freedoms 1 - Bush 0

« Reply #6 on: August 19, 2006, 09:04:58 AM »

Quote

more like Bush 10, but still I think this is a good start for a hopefully better future.

If you American types don't start doing a better job of choosing presidents, we're going to have to revoke your independence, you can be a colony again, we've given you a chance and you've just wasted it. Smiley

Logged

Lightbringer

Has a lot of posts

Posts By Osmosis

\*\*\*\*\*

Posts: 793

Karma: 0

Spiritual Warrior

[View Profile](#)

Re: American Freedoms 1 - Bush 0

« Reply #7 on: August 19, 2006, 10:22:26 AM »

Quote from: Philosopher on August 19, 2006, 09:04:58 AM

Quote

more like Bush 10, but still I think this is a good start for a hopefully better future.

If you American types don't start doing a better job of choosing presidents, we're going to have to revoke your independence, you can be a colony again, we've given you a chance and you've just wasted it. Smiley

Ironic considering Britain's legal system allows for much more aggressive pursuing of suspected terrorists (including holding without charges for 28 days, less required to arrest, etc). So much so that the system is being looked at by the president as a more effective model than their own since it's the reason Britain was able to stop the recent terror plot.

Logged

The thing that really fascinates me about people is their ability to have no idea what's going on even though it's going on in plain sight all around them and the even more amazing tendency to argue violently when one of these obvious things is presented to them.

Philosopher

Veritas Furniture

\*\*\*\*

Posts: 316

Karma: 0

Bah.

[View Profile](#)

Re: American Freedoms 1 - Bush 0

« Reply #8 on: August 19, 2006, 12:23:12 PM »

That all may well be true, but I can disregard it based on the fact I can't make a joke about it.

« Last Edit: August 19, 2006, 12:26:00 PM by Philosopher » Logged

Salubrion

Greenhorn

A Veritas Regular

\*\*

Posts: 64

Karma: 0

Greenhorn

[View Profile](#)

Re: American Freedoms 1 - Bush 0

« Reply #9 on: August 19, 2006, 12:49:54 PM »

Before you freak out about phone tapping of less then .001% of the population ( If that much, I doubt ) Why not complain about mandatory seatbelts, helmets, laws against drugs, or other laws that limit your freedoms for your safety. Don't get me wrong, I'm all for that, but there are larger issues then phone tapping a minute amount of people with some evidence that they could be terrorist.

Benjamin Franklin said "Those who give up liberty for a little temporary saftey deserve neither liberty or safety."

Logged

Razeroth

Veritas Furniture

\*\*\*\*

Posts: 269

Karma: 0

Ut intus , sic vacuus. As within, so without.

[View Profile](#)

Re: American Freedoms 1 - Bush 0

« Reply #10 on: August 19, 2006, 06:01:24 PM »

Why bother with politics anyway? No one ever wins in the long-run, because society says that only one person or a small group of people can have power. That in itself is full of negativity. Politics is just another system of control for those too scared or ignorant to fend for themselves. The myth that civilization wouldn't last without a hierarchy is an obvious show of idiocy. If everyone in the world were considered, then not only important political figures, but everyone would be protected by armed bodyguards, or no one at all would. Anyone who looks past the veils of secrecy can see that politics is just another poison that plaques the world. And the worst part of it all is that when people actually look to politicians for help, not everyone wins, and they are met with the excuse that "Not everyone can have what they want. You need to compromise." But compromise is yet another system of control set up by those with power too lazy to do anything about people who needed help, ages ago.

-Razeroth

Logged

"In the beginning, the primum mobile created the heavens and the earth, and imparted existence. The governing principle of the universe thusforth came forth: duality in its

glory..."  
Salubrion  
Greenhorn  
A Veritas Regular  
\*\*

Posts: 64  
Karma: 0

Greenhorn

[View Profile](#)

Re: American Freedoms 1 - Bush 0  
« Reply #11 on: August 19, 2006, 08:00:26 PM »

That is a load of ignorance Razer0th. First off, civilization can last without government, but only on a very small scale. The more people you have the more need there is for government. By small I mean say a 30-40 person town might be able to do ok, but still nothing would stop someone from killing whoever they want or stealing whatever they want.

Saying everyone would be protected by body guards is absolutly stupid, since that would require everyone to be a body guard to someone else. On top of that, there is a reason Presidents and other leaders have body guards. They are major targets, they skipped a few saftey procedures for JFK, and look what happened to him.

On the "viels of secrecy", and "not everyone really can have what they want". Some people want abortion, others don't. The goverment limits it, but tell me, since there just making excuses, I am sure you could come up with a solution where everyone wins. After you figure out that one, solve people who want to ban guns vs keep them legal, gay marriage, or immigrants. Your so wise and see past there control, I am sure we should get rid of government and your wisdom would stop people from just shooting each other when ethics cross.

Logged  
Razer0th  
Veritas Furniture  
\*\*\*\*

Posts: 269  
Karma: 0

Ut intus , sic vacuus. As within, so without.

[View Profile](#)

Re: American Freedoms 1 - Bush 0

« Reply #12 on: August 19, 2006, 08:48:08 PM »

No, survival would be in fact easier if there was no government. It would be survival of the fittest. There would be no laws, and people would all be equal. It would be considerably harder than operating under a government, but it would be conceivable. And my idea isn't ignorant. Politics is pure negativity. Just look at the obvious truth when it comes to politics: Not everyone is equal; not everyone can win.

-Razeroth

Logged

"In the beginning, the primum mobile created the heavens and the earth, and imparted existence. The governing principle of the universe thusforth came forth: duality in its glory..."

TakeV

Mad Scientist

Veritas Council

Posts By Osmosis

\*\*\*\*\*

Posts: 943

Karma: 52

[View Profile](#)

Re: American Freedoms 1 - Bush 0

« Reply #13 on: August 19, 2006, 08:51:52 PM »

Quote from: Razeroth on August 19, 2006, 08:48:08 PM

No, survival would be in fact easier if there was no government. It would be survival of the fittest. There would be no laws, and people would all be equal. It would be considerably harder than operating under a government, but it would be conceivable. And my idea isn't ignorant. Politics is pure negativity. Just look at the obvious truth when it comes to politics: Not everyone is equal; not everyone can win.

-Razeroth

Lets look to when that happened before, in the prehistoric era. People where hunters and gathers. They naturally grouped together, for better survival and hunts. Even then, there was one person or a small group calling the shots, deciding when and where the

group would go. This became the government when villages were formed. As long as peoples minds are wired the way they are, there will always be a top dog.

Logged  
Sigil for focus  
Best argument ever.  
Razeroth  
Veritas Furniture  
\*\*\*\*

Posts: 269  
Karma: 0

Ut intus , sic vacuus. As within, so without.

[View Profile](#)

Re: American Freedoms 1 - Bush 0

« Reply #14 on: August 19, 2006, 09:59:21 PM »

If people's minds were NOT wired they are now, then things could, concievably be better. But it would take a while of adapting. Weak-minded people naturally look to those with power for help. When that help doesn't come, they don't do anything about it. That's the problem with politics. It is an unfair game, won through manipulation and coercion to one side.

-Razeroth  
Logged

"In the beginning, the primum mobile created the heavens and the earth, and imparted existence. The governing principle of the universe thusforth came forth: duality in its glory..."

Pages: [1] 2 3      [Print](#)

« previous next »

Jump to:

=> [Main Hall](#)

Powered by MySQL Powered by PHP    Powered by SMF 1.1.19 | SMF © 2013, Simple Machines

Oxygen design by Bloc    Valid XHTML 1.0! Valid CSS!

<http://forums.vociety.net/index.php/topic%2C8937.15.html>

2 captures

07 Jul 2010 - 01 May 2013

Apr    MAY    Jun

01

2012 2013 2014

About this capture  
The Veritas Society

\*

\*HomeForumsChatHelpSearchRetroLoginRegister

Welcome, Guest. Please login or register.

Did you miss your activation email?

April 30, 2013, 11:23:10 PM

Forever

Login with username, password and session length

Search:

Advanced search

207363 Posts in 14735 Topics by 18410 Members - Latest Member: - MindDisciple

Most online today: 98 - most online ever: 430 (June 28, 2007, 02:58:51 PM)

+ The Veritas Society

|-+ The Auditorium

||-+ Main Hall

|||-+ American Freedoms 1 - Bush 0 0 Members and 1 Guest are viewing this topic.

« previous next »

Pages: 1 [2] 3 Print

Author Topic: American Freedoms 1 - Bush 0 (Read 4022 times)

Fajjer

Existential Pragmatist

Veritas Moderator

Posts By Osmosis

\*\*\*\*\*

Posts: 3199

Karma: 41

The Devil's Advocate

View Profile WWW

Re: American Freedoms 1 - Bush 0

« Reply #15 on: August 20, 2006, 04:08:59 AM »

Quote from: Razer0th

The myth that civilization wouldn't last without a hierarchy is an obvious show of idiocy. Not taking the word of someone I barely know over an Internet medium, I would like to know who has pointed to it as being a myth.

It's a generally accepted principle that a society large enough requires a governmental system, or all you have is what's known as anarchy. When interactions take place between hundreds or thousands, or millions of people (note people, not wild animals), then 'survival of the fittest' is not a viable alternative to a governmental system that allows for order and organisation, the cornerstones of society, to be present.

There is a specific reason why we are where we are in terms of anything that you could name: evolution. As intelligent beings we seek to make things better than they are, and we have moved through several political categories before ending up where we are. Things will probably change in the future as we attempt to improve more, but anarchy and 'survival of the fittest' are concepts and ways of doing things that have long since past.

Additionally, according to Wikipedia, "Survival of the fittest is a phrase which is a shorthand for a concept relating to competition for survival or predominance." Therefore, in an intelligent species that naturally searches to apply its own order on the natural world and each other, predominance between individuals could more literally be translated as the Alpha Male, and therein is a heirarchical system (that is also present in wild animals - now surely you should realise that if they're doing it, it serves a purpose).

I would suggest you move past your teenage ideals and look into why society and politics are necessary to sustain a civilisation, rather than suggesting that a 'natural' (politics is natural anyway) or 'suvival' way is better, and politics are thus inherently inferior.

« Last Edit: August 22, 2006, 08:44:32 AM by Faijer » Logged

My WordPress Blog is updated regularly.

NEW UPDATE: Life begins at conception: A thought experiment (29/08/2012)

`Nazukarr

Posts By Osmosis

\*\*\*\*\*

Posts: 616

Karma: 11

[View Profile](#)

Re: American Freedoms 1 - Bush 0

« Reply #16 on: August 20, 2006, 09:57:54 AM »

And does it honestly matter if politics is corrupted or not? Does it matter that a small



group of people have power over a huge group? Yes, it does. Politics does matter because that small group of people are governing \_our\_ lives. To completely ignore it, is idiocy. You would have no idea about what is happening to the world around you. The Government in America, for instance, works in a system of checks and balances, where each branch of the government keeps an eye on what the other branches are up to. We, as citizens, are the people who are keeping an eye on ALL of them. We give politicians suggestions, and they make them into laws, or they change a law that's already out. Ideally, in the end, it's helping us citizens peacefully and smoothly live our lives.

And why are we arguing this anyway? It's not like we can change anything about the government today, so arguing about whether anarchy is the best way to go or not is irrelevant.

« Last Edit: August 20, 2006, 10:03:09 AM by Nazukarr »      Logged

Reality is easy. It's deception that's the hard work. - Lauryn Hill

Razeroth

Veritas Furniture

\*\*\*\*

Posts: 269

Karma: 0

Ut intus , sic vacuus. As within, so without.

[View Profile](#)

Re: American Freedoms 1 - Bush 0

« Reply #17 on: August 20, 2006, 06:46:50 PM »

It is quite conceivable that the world would last without any type of government. After adapting, humans would assimilate to the new way of life. It would only take time...

-Razeroth

« Last Edit: August 22, 2006, 08:44:56 AM by Faijer »      Logged

"In the beginning, the primum mobile created the heavens and the earth, and imparted existence. The governing principle of the universe thusforth came forth: duality in its glory..."

Bladesmith

A Familiar Feature

\*\*\*

Posts: 134

Karma: 0

---Bend the bar while the iron is hot.---

[View Profile](#)

Re: American Freedoms 1 - Bush 0

« Reply #18 on: August 20, 2006, 08:16:50 PM »

Point: The phrase "United States" implies a group of separate national entities banded together for a common purpose.

Point: If the entities are separate, they should ensure their own safety, not depend on some higher governing body. (i.e. "...a well regulated militia being essential to the security of a free state...")

Conclusion: The states should handle their own business, and the federal government should only step in when the state calls on them for help.

A government should protect its (posessive case deliberately not used) people from foreign aggressors and regulate trade with other nations, but little else.

---The Bladesmith---

Logged

"Think not that I am come to send peace on earth: I came not to send peace, but a sword."

-Jesus Christ (Matthew 10:34)

Fajjer

Existential Pragmatist

Veritas Moderator

Posts By Osmosis

\*\*\*\*\*

Posts: 3199

Karma: 41

The Devil's Advocate

[View Profile WWW](#)

Re: American Freedoms 1 - Bush 0

« Reply #19 on: August 21, 2006, 05:15:27 AM »

Quote from: Razer0th

It is quite concievable that the world would last without any type of government. After

adapting, humans would assimilate to the new way of life. It would only take time... Quite conceivable? By what standard? What are you basing this belief on?

And after adapting, we would assimilate what? Assimilation is the taking of something else and incorporating it into your own, whom would there be left to assimilate? And what makes you think that it would spiral off in completely different directions to what we have now? Why would we not just end up exactly where we are a few hundred years down the line?

« Last Edit: August 22, 2006, 08:43:44 AM by Faijer » Logged

My WordPress Blog is updated regularly.

NEW UPDATE: Life begins at conception: A thought experiment (29/08/2012)

Big Boss

Friggen Crazy

Veritas Moderator

Posts By Osmosis

\*\*\*\*\*

Posts: 1458

Karma: 3

Owner of 100000 V-Points

[View Profile WWW](#)

Re: American Freedoms 1 - Bush 0

« Reply #20 on: August 21, 2006, 12:06:06 PM »

Quote from: Rafnul! on August 19, 2006, 06:52:15 AM

Quote from: Martial Thoughts on August 18, 2006, 10:42:21 PM

Lately I've been thinking. What's more terrifying than having someone tell you almost every day that the middle east hates America and will stop at nothing to harm us all? I think this NSA program is just another terror tactic used to force (ease) us into submission.

Well, that sounds kind of nice, except the the point of phone surveillance is to protect us from the thousands of people in the middle east who hate America and will stop at nothing to harm us all.

Ever thought that maybe people don't hate us Americans as much as we're told? I have no proof of this, of course, but I don't think our American landmarks and buildings are bombed as much as we think. Sometimes it's even by our own people (oklahoma city ring a bell?). Japan was hit a few years ago by the subway gas thing, britain had train bombings and just recently the foiled airplane bombings. America had... 911... and supposedly so many foiled attempts. I am suspicious, and I'm not going to jump to far

into the conclusions, I just fear that we are being brainwashed into believing something that isn't as true as it really is.

Logged

Join my Folding@Home team and do some good! #159490

Details at <http://folding.stanford.edu/>

Razeroth

Veritas Furniture

\*\*\*\*

Posts: 269

Karma: 0

Ut intus , sic vacuus. As within, so without.

View Profile

Re: American Freedoms 1 - Bush 0

« Reply #21 on: August 21, 2006, 01:39:18 PM »

Well, we wouldn't end up the same if we acted differently in the beginning stages of having no government. As for what would be left to assimilate, that would be different actions designed for more freedom without a government. It would be survival of the fittest...all over again. But based on how society is today, I don't think a majority would find this idea pleasing opposed to what they have now...what I'm saying is that survival would be possible if there was no government and that we would have more freedom, albeit more sacrifice as well.

-Razeroth

P.S. What I meant by keeping my e-mail hidden was making it hidden on my profile, which it is, so I don't know how you got it, aside from being a mod...

Logged

"In the beginning, the primum mobile created the heavens and the earth, and imparted existence. The governing principle of the universe thusforth came forth: duality in its glory..."

Philosopher

Veritas Furniture

\*\*\*\*

Posts: 316

Karma: 0

Bah.

[View Profile](#)

Re: American Freedoms 1 - Bush 0

« Reply #22 on: August 21, 2006, 03:00:01 PM »

Razeroth, Anarchy would not bring more freedom but less. You're argument is flawed because your conception of freedom is flawed. Freedom is not simply a lack of restriction on what you can do, that is a part of it, but there's more, you're thinking in terms of what you are free from (negative freedom,) but you disregard what you are free to do. (Positive freedom)

Logged

Salubrium

Greenhorn

A Veritas Regular

\*\*

Posts: 64

Karma: 0

Greenhorn

[View Profile](#)

Re: American Freedoms 1 - Bush 0

« Reply #23 on: August 21, 2006, 07:00:00 PM »

Also Razeroth, survival of the fittest would mean we would lose all of our technology and much if not almost all of the knowledge we have accumulated. Without a society, that would all be destroyed, whether or not the human race survives ( Which it would )

Bladesmith, you obviously have no idea what you're talking about. First off, despite what the our name implies we are a federal state. What you are suggesting is a confederate state, and every confederate state has failed. History has shown only federal or union states can survive. But I doubt you know what I am talking about, since your last post showed your ignorance. So why not look up some stuff on civics and then respond.

PS. ( A state is a nation/country, you're talking about States )

Logged

kobok

Veritas Council

Tech Team

Posts By Osmosis

\*\*\*\*\*

Posts: 4743

Karma: 148

Veritas Council

[View Profile](#)

Re: American Freedoms 1 - Bush 0

« Reply #24 on: August 21, 2006, 09:29:32 PM »

Quote from: Salubriion on August 19, 2006, 12:49:54 PM

Before you freak out about phone tapping of less then .001% of the population ( If that much, I doubt )

2.5 trillion phone call logs have been handed over to the NSA. This consists of every call placed or routed by AT&T, SBC, Verizon, and BellSouth, since around February of 2001, which was when the requests were first made. If your phone service is with any of these companies, routed through any of these companies, or you called anyone from any of these companies, than this includes you, and without a warrant to observe who you are talking to.

Another component of this program allows direct access to the raw data of nearly all internet traffic. These programs are not performed by the NSA properly requesting records and receiving them, but instead, these programs are executed by giving the NSA direct access to the entirety of the raw data as it arrives, so that they can observe and record whatever data they choose without supervision or oversight.

We know that an unspecified number around "tens of thousands" of people have been the subject of police investigations without any judicial warrant as a basis of this program. This means that countless more conversations and traffic contents had to be observed to identify that number of people. The number of citizens that are at least known to have been actively investigated by police on the basis of this program is around 10 times as many as your estimate.

And to make things worse, investigators who have been following up on these leads have come forward to say that they go through thousands of them, and find no leads with any of them. In fact, no one has actually brought forth a single benefit to national security from any of these programs. But what we do know for sure is that the privacy of millions of Americans has been searched and violated without Warrant, without probable cause, and without Oath or affirmation. This not only threatens the longterm preservation of a free democracy, but it also violates the highest law of the land, and it deserved the royal smacking from on high that it got.

Logged  
Faijer  
Existential Pragmatist  
Veritas Moderator  
Posts By Osmosis  
\*\*\*\*\*

Posts: 3199  
Karma: 41

The Devil's Advocate

[View Profile WWW](#)

Re: American Freedoms 1 - Bush 0  
« Reply #25 on: August 22, 2006, 05:06:43 AM »  
Quote from: Razer0th

Well, we wouldn't end up the same if we acted differently in the beginning stages of having no government. As for what would be left to assimilate, that would be different actions designed for more freedom without a government. It would be survival of the fittest...all over again. But based on how society is today, I don't think a majority would find this idea pleasing opposed to what they have now...what I'm saying is that survival would be possible if there was no government and that we would have more freedom, albeit more sacrifice as well.

We wouldn't end up the same? What is this theory based on? Your opinion by the looks of it, because I see absolutely no tangible evidence or supporting theorem. Unless you care to cite some professional works.

Different actions designed for more freedom without a government... Such as? You've talking about freedoms and about all of these wonderous possibilities of anarchy, but have yet to mention a single benefit.

Survival of the fittest all over again. Why? We had that, we passed it. It's a mode of behaviour that is attributed to that which is fighting for survival. We are not, and there is nothing wrong with that because we can evolve in other ways, without the need for any of the traditional mechanisms that take place in the rest of the natural world.

Yes, there is a reason people would be opposed to this idea: It's ridiculous. What you propose is to take humanity back a few thousand years to a point when people were far more savage. We have a civilization that, despite obviously needing further improvement (when does a civilization never need improvement?), works far better than the systems of old. There is a reason that this is so: societal evolution. We have moved through modes of government because they did not work as well as the ones which

replaced them. That's what evolution is at a human level, beyond the biological evolution of adaptation to environment, it takes on a new path: the search for perfection.

« Last Edit: August 22, 2006, 08:45:18 AM by Faijer » Logged

My WordPress Blog is updated regularly.

NEW UPDATE: Life begins at conception: A thought experiment (29/08/2012)

Razeroth

Veritas Furniture

\*\*\*\*

Posts: 269

Karma: 0

Ut intus , sic vacuus. As within, so without.

[View Profile](#)

Re: American Freedoms 1 - Bush 0

« Reply #26 on: August 22, 2006, 10:46:19 AM »

And what I am presenting could possibly be the next link in that evolution. Understand that I typed "possibly." That is not to suggest that I think it IS, only that it could be one of many. By the way, there would be no citation for what evidence I stand by as it is my opinion based on my own experience, which I have not recorded as I didn't anticipate discussing it with anyone else.

-Razeroth

Logged

"In the beginning, the primum mobile created the heavens and the earth, and imparted existence. The governing principle of the universe thusforth came forth: duality in its glory..."

Faijer

Existential Pragmatist

Veritas Moderator

Posts By Osmosis

\*\*\*\*\*

Posts: 3199

Karma: 41

[The Devil's Advocate](#)

[View Profile WWW](#)



Re: American Freedoms 1 - Bush 0

« Reply #27 on: August 22, 2006, 11:04:56 AM »

Quote from: Razer0th

And what I am presenting could possibly be the next link in that evolution. Understand that I typed "possibly." That is not to suggest that I think it IS, only that it could be one of many. By the way, there would be no citation for what evidence I stand by as it is my opinion based on my own experience, which I have not recorded as I didn't anticipate discussing it with anyone else.

Experience? What kind of experience? You're in a debate here, you have to be provided to give a little more detail than what you have. Because so far, your argument is below weak...

Logged

My WordPress Blog is updated regularly.

NEW UPDATE: Life begins at conception: A thought experiment (29/08/2012)

Razer0th

Veritas Furniture

\*\*\*\*

Posts: 269

Karma: 0

Ut intus , sic vacuus. As within, so without.

[View Profile](#)

Re: American Freedoms 1 - Bush 0

« Reply #28 on: August 22, 2006, 11:10:21 AM »

A debate? I'm just presenting an opinion. I don't really have an argument other than what I think about my own opinion. That may be perceived as weak, and it probably is, seeing as I don't have the aid of scientific statistics to help me "win."

I don't really care about arguing my point as I don't have any formal data to provide, though I respect your opinion of my views being ignorant and otherwise.

-Razer0th

Logged

"In the beginning, the primum mobile created the heavens and the earth, and imparted existence. The governing principle of the universe thusforth came forth: duality in its glory..."

Faijer

Existential Pragmatist

Veritas Moderator

Posts By Osmosis

\*\*\*\*\*

Posts: 3199

Karma: 41

The Devil's Advocate

[View Profile WWW](#)

Re: American Freedoms 1 - Bush 0

« Reply #29 on: August 22, 2006, 11:40:12 AM »

So, you're more interested in preserving your opinion than engaging in a formal discussion in order to determine the veracity of it?

Logged

My WordPress Blog is updated regularly.

NEW UPDATE: Life begins at conception: A thought experiment (29/08/2012)

Pages: 1 [2] 3      [Print](#)

« previous next »

Jump to:

=> [Main Hall](#)

Powered by MySQL Powered by PHP    Powered by SMF 1.1.18 | SMF © 2013, Simple Machines

Oxygen design by Bloc    Valid XHTML 1.0! Valid CSS!

<http://forums.v society.net/index.php/topic%2C8937.30.html>

2 captures

7 Jul 2010 - 1 May 2013

Jul    MAY    Jun

01

2010   2013   2014

[About this capture](#)

The Veritas Society

\*

[\\*Home](#)[Forums](#)[Chat](#)[Help](#)[Search](#)[Retro](#)[Login](#)[Register](#)

Welcome, Guest. Please login or register.

[Did you miss your activation email?](#)

May 01, 2013, 09:12:06 AM

Forever

Login with username, password and session length  
Search:

Advanced search

207365 Posts in 14735 Topics by 18410 Members - Latest Member: - MindDisciple  
Most online today: 80 - most online ever: 430 (June 28, 2007, 02:58:51 PM)

+ The Veritas Society

|-+ The Auditorium

||-+ Main Hall

||-+ American Freedoms 1 - Bush 0 0 Members and 1 Guest are viewing this topic.  
« previous next »

Pages: 1 2 [3] Print

Author Topic: American Freedoms 1 - Bush 0 (Read 4032 times)

Razeroth

Veritas Furniture

\*\*\*\*

Posts: 269

Karma: 0

Ut intus , sic vacuus. As within, so without.

View Profile

Re: American Freedoms 1 - Bush 0

« Reply #30 on: August 22, 2006, 12:13:33 PM »

Judging from where I stand with a lack of the means to win the discussion, and weak reputation here overall, I would have to say...yes to that question.

-Razeroth

Logged

"In the beginning, the primum mobile created the heavens and the earth, and imparted existence. The governing principle of the universe thusforth came forth: duality in its glory..."

Faijer

Existential Pragmatist

Veritas Moderator

Posts By Osmosis

\*\*\*\*\*

Posts: 3199

Karma: 41

The Devil's Advocate

[View Profile WWW](#)

Re: American Freedoms 1 - Bush 0

« Reply #31 on: August 23, 2006, 05:09:51 AM »

It's not really a case of your entire argument being weak. Only what I've seen so far. Surely there's more to it that you've yet to share. It's also not about winning, but about determining whether you are intrinsically right or not. At the end of the day, even if you have to back out and walk away with your tail between your legs because they wouldn't listen to reason, if you know you're right, that's all that matters.

Logged

My WordPress Blog is updated regularly.

NEW UPDATE: Life begins at conception: A thought experiment (29/08/2012)

Razeroth

Veritas Furniture

\*\*\*\*

Posts: 269

Karma: 0

Ut intus , sic vacuus. As within, so without.

[View Profile](#)

Re: American Freedoms 1 - Bush 0

« Reply #32 on: August 23, 2006, 01:47:22 PM »

Ah, well thanks for that, Faijer, and good job arguing against my point (no sarcasm intended).

-Razeroth

Logged

"In the beginning, the primum mobile created the heavens and the earth, and imparted existence. The governing principle of the universe thusforth came forth: duality in its glory..."

Pages: 1 2 [3]      [Print](#)

« previous next »

[Jump to:](#)

=> Main Hall

Powered by MySQL Powered by PHP Powered by SMF 1.1.18 | SMF © 2013, Simple Machines

Oxygen design by Bloc Valid XHTML 1.0! Valid CSS!

<http://forums.vociety.net/index.php?topic=8794.0>

4 captures

7 Jul 2010 - 17 Jul 2014

Sep JUL Aug

17

2011 2014 2015

About this capture

The Veritas Society

\*

\*HomeForumsChatHelpSearchRetroLoginRegister

Welcome, Guest. Please login or register.

Did you miss your activation email?

July 17, 2014, 02:21:50 AM

Forever

Login with username, password and session length

Search:

Advanced search

214929 Posts in 15321 Topics by 19763 Members - Latest Member: - ksyahu Most online today: 103 - most online ever: 430 (June 28, 2007, 02:58:51 PM)

+ The Veritas Society

|-+ The Auditorium

| |-+ Main Hall

|| |-+ Congress vs. Online Communities 0 Members and 1 Guest are viewing this topic. « previous next »

Pages: [1] Print

Author Topic: Congress vs. Online Communities (Read 2873 times)

kobok

Veritas Council

Tech Team

Posts By Osmosis

\*\*\*\*\*

Posts: 4891

Karma: 158

Veritas Council

[View Profile](#)

Congress vs. Online Communities

« on: July 29, 2006, 01:48:52 AM »

The U.S. House of Representatives passed a bill on July 27th, with a 410-15 vote, which would prohibit access to any chat rooms or social networking websites from public libraries or schools unless someone can verify that they are an adult. This bill would prohibit access to sites like Amazon, Slashdot, Myspace, and Veritas, for anyone using a public library or a school computer, unless this person can verify that he or she is 18 or older.

[http://news.com.com/2100-1028\\_3-6099414.html?part=rss&tag=6099414&subj=news](http://news.com.com/2100-1028_3-6099414.html?part=rss&tag=6099414&subj=news)

If approved by the Senate, this will be law. If you live in the U.S., I figured you should know what your government is working on this week, as it may impact some of your lives.

The rationale given is for the purpose of protecting children from "sexual predators". The full text of the bill is [here](#).

« Last Edit: July 29, 2006, 11:53:55 AM by kobok »      Logged

Latest article: Construct Dynamics

Want to learn psi? Check out our collection of psi articles.

[Daska\\_123](#)

A Familiar Feature

\*\*\*

Posts: 104

Karma: 0

I think I'm beginning to understand...

[View Profile](#)

Re: Congress vs. Online Communities

« Reply #1 on: July 29, 2006, 01:55:16 AM »

Quote from: kobok on July 29, 2006, 01:48:52 AM

The U.S. House of Representatives passed a bill on July 27th, with a 410-15 vote, which would prohibit access to any chat rooms or social networking websites from public libraries or schools unless someone can verify that they are an adult. This bill would prohibit access to sites like Amazon, Slashdot, Myspace, and Veritas, for anyone using a public library or a school computer, unless this person can verify that he or she is 18 or older.

[http://news.com.com/2100-1028\\_3-6099414.html?part=rss&tag=6099414&subj=news](http://news.com.com/2100-1028_3-6099414.html?part=rss&tag=6099414&subj=news)

If approved by the Senate, this will be law. If you live in the U.S., I figured you should know what your government is working on this week, as it may impact some of your lives.

The rationale given is for the purpose of protecting children from "sexual predators". The full text of the bill is here.

.- Stupid laws these days Tongue So yeah -.- lol

Logged

Singer. Writer. Adventurist.

Big Boss

Friggen Crazy

Posts By Osmosis

\*\*\*\*\*

Posts: 1458

Karma: 3

Owner of 100000 V-Points

[View Profile WWW](#)

Re: Congress vs. Online Communities

« Reply #2 on: July 29, 2006, 05:17:21 AM »

that's a tough one to work around... I mean, I think it's not a bad idea really when it comes to myspace and such, although myspace is doing its own thing to help protect kids. I wonder if a law like this is necessary... hmm, well all the kiddies need to do is have a parent sign a permission form from the looks of it. I personally am more concerned with net neutrality that affects everyone, instead of a law that only affects those under 18 years of age...

edit: of course, I only say that cause I'm almost 20 now.

« Last Edit: July 29, 2006, 05:19:19 AM by Martial Thoughts »  
Join my Folding@Home team and do some good! #159490

Logged

Details at <http://folding.stanford.edu/>

solstice

Dreamwalker

Posts By Osmosis

\*\*\*\*\*

Posts: 2114

Karma: -4

"Receive and transmit..."

View Profile

Re: Congress vs. Online Communities

« Reply #3 on: July 29, 2006, 08:11:33 AM »

Actually, I think that is a good idea.

Logged

Tell all the Truth but tell it slant: Success in Circuit lies. Too bright for our infirm  
Delight. The Truth's superb surprise. As Lightning to the Children eased, with  
explanation kind. The Truth must dazzle gradually, or every man be blind.

Tefeari: The Giant Impact Hypothesis is a theory

Rafnul!

he-who-posts-lots

Veritas Moderator

Posts By Osmosis

\*\*\*\*\*

Posts: 1081

Karma: 28

View Profile

Re: Congress vs. Online Communities

« Reply #4 on: July 29, 2006, 08:40:46 AM »

I take it that going to Burger King if you are under the age of 18 is going to be illegal too.

Logged

`Nazukarr



Posts By Osmosis

\*\*\*\*\*

Posts: 627

Karma: 15

[View Profile](#)

Re: Congress vs. Online Communities

« Reply #5 on: July 29, 2006, 08:48:50 AM »

Ugh. Wow. Thats horrible. Why do they blame chat rooms for kids getting laid with 40-year-olds? The kids are the dumbasses.

Logged

"I am not this hair, I am not this skin, I am the soul that lives within."

kakkarot

0. The Fool... Inverted?

Posts By Osmosis

\*\*\*\*\*

Posts: 2701

Karma: 3

Pirate "Not-A-Mod" BoB

[View Profile](#)

Re: Congress vs. Online Communities

« Reply #6 on: July 29, 2006, 09:00:08 AM »

naz: because not all of the kids are willing. some/many of them are, certainly, but many also just think they're meeting up with someone to become friends and .. they turn out to not be friends.

~kakkarot

Logged

Philippians 2:5 Your attitude should be the same as that of Christ Jesus: 6 Who, being in very nature God, did not consider equality with God something to be grasped, 7 but made himself nothing, taking the very nature of a servant, being made in human likeness.

Rafnul!

he-who-posts-lots

Veritas Moderator  
Posts By Osmosis

\*\*\*\*\*

Posts: 1081  
Karma: 28

[View Profile](#)

Re: Congress vs. Online Communities

« Reply #7 on: July 29, 2006, 10:40:32 AM »

I know it's cute to blame myspace and all that. I read an article in a local newspaper about a girl I knew in high school posting all of her info on facebook like her phone number and address. Her mom in the article was like "I don't think kids realize how dangerous that is." Then, of course, I loooked up her phone number and address in the PHONE BOOK and called her.

BURN THE PHONE BOOKS OMG STALKERZZZ AHHGGHHHH!!!!1111

Logged

kobok

Veritas Council

Tech Team

Posts By Osmosis

\*\*\*\*\*

Posts: 4891  
Karma: 158

[Veritas Council](#)

[View Profile](#)

Re: Congress vs. Online Communities

« Reply #8 on: July 29, 2006, 12:07:51 PM »

Quote from: kakkarot on July 29, 2006, 09:00:08 AM

naz: because not all of the kids are willing. some/many of them are, certainly, but many also just think they're meeting up with someone to become friends and .. they turn out to not be friends.

1. The problem here is not the internet. No one is sexually assaulted over the internet

because, well, it's electronic, and physical contact cannot be performed electronically unless you pick up a motherboard and hit someone with it. The problem is the physical contact, which is quite independent of any means of communication.

2. In reality, how common is sexual assault from sexual predators on the internet? An objective examination shows that it's extraordinarily rare.

Logged

Latest article: Construct Dynamics

Want to learn psi? Check out our collection of psi articles.

freefallingdot

A Veritas Regular

\*\*

Posts: 98

Karma: 0

The Knight of Swords

[View Profile](#)

Re: Congress vs. Online Communities

« Reply #9 on: July 29, 2006, 12:22:41 PM »

Yes, but since when has politics ever been objective?

Logged

Boldly, I bow to the banished, bend knee to the broken, and break bread with the bereaved. Behold the breath-taking beauty of brutality, of quick and permanent change, breaking the lines built to seperate polarities. Brashly blending that which can't be bent.

TheThing

Posts By Osmosis

\*\*\*\*\*

Posts: 561

Karma: 0

[View Profile](#)

Re: Congress vs. Online Communities

« Reply #10 on: July 29, 2006, 01:44:33 PM »

This is interesting, besides 90% of people will not be accesssing veritas though schools or librarys. Plus a lot of us are over 18 [ me for example] so it's not that bad. Still the goverment feeds on misinformed panic always have always will.

Logged  
TheThings's Flatmate.  
Big Boss  
Friggen Crazy  
Posts By Osmosis  
\*\*\*\*\*

Posts: 1458  
Karma: 3

Owner of 100000 V-Points

[View Profile WWW](#)

Re: Congress vs. Online Communities

« Reply #11 on: July 29, 2006, 02:20:46 PM »

after reading that objective argument, I've gotta say, people are dumb. I thought about american fear alot awhile ago, and I don't understand why we rely on the government to fix every single one of our insignificant problems. fix it yourself danget! if your kid is posting info on the internet, stop them, duh.

Logged  
Join my Folding@Home team and do some good! #159490

Details at <http://folding.stanford.edu/solstice>  
Dreamwalker  
Posts By Osmosis  
\*\*\*\*\*

Posts: 2114  
Karma: -4

"Receive and transmit..."

[View Profile](#)

Re: Congress vs. Online Communities

« Reply #12 on: July 30, 2006, 03:40:23 AM »

Quote

Ugh. Wow. Thats horrible. Why do they blame chat rooms for kids getting laid with 40-year-olds? The kids are the dumbasses.

Because that is how predators can hunt. And that is how little kids think they made a friend, who just happens to ask them to take their clothes off in front of a webcam.

Gods know, kids know everything and adults should leave them alone... lol.

Quote

The vast majority of crimes against children are committed not by released sex offenders, but instead by the victim's own family, church clergy, and family friends. According to the National Center for Missing and Exploited Children, "based on what we know about those who harm children, the danger to children is greater from someone they or their family knows than from a stranger." If lawmakers and the public are serious about wanting to protect children, they should not be misled by "stranger danger" myths and instead focus on the much larger threat inside the home.

See? It's okay to defy your parents Tongue

« Last Edit: July 30, 2006, 03:48:56 AM by solstice »    Logged

Tell all the Truth but tell it slant: Success in Circuit lies.    Too bright for our infirm Delight. The Truth's superb surprise. As Lightning to the Children eased, with explanation kind.    The Truth must dazzle gradually, or every man be blind.

Tefeari: The Giant Impact Hypothesis is a theory

Rafnul!

he-who-posts-lots

Veritas Moderator

Posts By Osmosis

\*\*\*\*\*

Posts: 1081

Karma: 28

[View Profile](#)

Re: Congress vs. Online Communities

« Reply #13 on: July 30, 2006, 03:07:15 PM »

This is why little kids should be taught to hate and mistrust ALL adults.

Logged

Daska\_123

A Familiar Feature

\*\*\*

Posts: 104

Karma: 0

I think I'm beginning to understand...

[View Profile](#)

Re: Congress vs. Online Communities

« Reply #14 on: August 03, 2006, 08:32:39 AM »

\*cough\*

Quote from: solstice on July 30, 2006, 03:40:23 AM

Quote

Ugh. Wow. Thats horrible. Why do they blame chat rooms for kids getting laid with 40-year-olds? The kids are the dumbasses.

Because that is how predators can hunt. And that is how little kids think they made a friend, who just happens to ask them to take their clothes off in front of a webcam.

Gods know, kids know everything and adults should leave them alone... lol.

Quote

The vast majority of crimes against children are committed not by released sex offenders, but instead by the victim's own family, church clergy, and family friends. According to the National Center for Missing and Exploited Children, "based on what we know about those who harm children, the danger to children is greater from someone they or their family knows than from a stranger." If lawmakers and the public are serious about wanting to protect children, they should not be misled by "stranger danger" myths and instead focus on the much larger threat inside the home.

See? It's okay to defy your parents Tongue

Yeah I know a 10 year old who knows all about sex and a 9 year old who knows a lil bit about it its weird...

Quote from: TheThing on July 29, 2006, 01:44:33 PM

This is interesting, besides 90% of people will not be accesssing veritas though schools or librarys. Plus a lot of us are over 18 [ me for example] so it's not that bad. Still the goverment feeds on misinformed panic always have always will.

\*cough\* True probably not that many people will access veritas through librarys and school espically since some schools instantly block veritas and that. But just for the record a lot of us are around 14 from my experience.

Logged

Singer. Writer. Adventurist.

Pages: [1]    Print

« previous next »

Jump to:

=> Main Hall

Powered by MySQL Powered by PHP Powered by SMF 1.1.19 | SMF © 2013, Simple Machines

Oxygen design by Bloc Valid XHTML 1.0! Valid CSS!

<http://forums.vociety.net/index.php?topic=8834.0>

4 captures

7 Jul 2010 - 17 Jul 2014

Sep JUL Aug

17

2011 2014 2015

About this capture

The Veritas Society

\*

\*HomeForumsChatHelpSearchRetroLoginRegister

Welcome, Guest. Please login or register.

Did you miss your activation email?

July 17, 2014, 03:37:04 AM

Forever

Login with username, password and session length

Search:

Advanced search

214930 Posts in 15322 Topics by 19763 Members - Latest Member: - ksyahu Most  
online today: 110 - most online ever: 430 (June 28, 2007, 02:58:51 PM)

+ The Veritas Society

|-+ The Auditorium

||-+ Main Hall

|||-+ Stem Cell Research 0 Members and 1 Guest are viewing this topic. «

previous next »

Pages: [1] 2 Print

Author Topic: Stem Cell Research (Read 3896 times)

Australian Warriors

Veritas Furniture

\*\*\*\*

Posts: 420

Karma: 0

[View Profile](#)

Stem Cell Research

« on: August 04, 2006, 10:03:05 PM »

It's been on the news alot lately, and they seem to think it has wonderful curing potential. Whats your opinion about it?

Logged  
Siirenias  
Settling In

\*

Posts: 24

Karma: 0

[View Profile WWW](#)

Re: Stem Cell Research

« Reply #1 on: August 05, 2006, 01:23:50 AM »

A month or so ago, Scientific American's cover had "Stem Cells Cause Cancer?" written across it. Needless to say, I did not read the article in depth.

Logged  
Big Boss  
Friggen Crazy  
Posts By Osmosis

\*\*\*\*\*

Posts: 1458

Karma: 3

Owner of 100000 V-Points

[View Profile WWW](#)

Re: Stem Cell Research

« Reply #2 on: August 05, 2006, 05:37:17 AM »

my understanding has been that stem cells only have the potential to be turned into cells that would benefit us. That's why they want to research it, not to mass produce, but to figure out how to employ the cells to our use. They have potential, yes, but we need



to figure out how to unlock the potential. until then, try not to sever your spine.

Logged

Join my Folding@Home team and do some good! #159490

Details at <http://folding.stanford.edu/>

kakkarot

0. The Fool... Inverted?

Posts By Osmosis

\*\*\*\*\*

Posts: 2701

Karma: 3

Pirate "Not-A-Mod" BoB

View Profile

Re: Stem Cell Research

« Reply #3 on: August 06, 2006, 03:23:23 PM »

stem cells = awesome, as long as it's not abused.

~kakkarot

Logged

Philippians 2:5 Your attitude should be the same as that of Christ Jesus: 6 Who, being in very nature God, did not consider equality with God something to be grasped, 7 but made himself nothing, taking the very nature of a servant, being made in human likeness.

solstice

Dreamwalker

Posts By Osmosis

\*\*\*\*\*

Posts: 2114

Karma: -4

"Receive and transmit..."

View Profile

Re: Stem Cell Research

« Reply #4 on: August 06, 2006, 05:35:04 PM »

Stem cell research in medicine seems to have a LOT of potential. Unfortunately in the United States, the ignorant rich people who run the country don't understand how it works, so they assume that it is murder -- our fearless leader recently vetoed a bill which would permit its applications.

If any one does not know, stem cells are usually taken from aborted fetuses and from umbilical cords. To my knowledge, they do not actually have to murder anything to get what they need.

Logged

Tell all the Truth but tell it slant: Success in Circuit lies. Too bright for our infirm Delight. The Truth's superb surprise. As Lightning to the Children eased, with explanation kind. The Truth must dazzle gradually, or every man be blind.

Tefeari: The Giant Impact Hypothesis is a theory

Zake

Veritas Staff

Veritas Moderator

Posts By Osmosis

\*\*\*\*\*

Posts: 1722

Karma: 1

Veritas Staff

[View Profile](#)

Re: Stem Cell Research

« Reply #5 on: August 06, 2006, 05:47:50 PM »

They wouldn't even have to use aborted fetuses, under the bill that Bush vetoed- they would use excess embryos from IVF procedures which would be destroyed anyway. It confuses me, therefore, that they won't allow stem cell research, which won't increase the number of destroyed embryos (whatever moral meaning that would have), and at the same time they do allow IVF, which is responsible for lots of embryo destruction in the first place.

It deserves saying another time, too, that the benefits of stem cell technology would be enormous. Part of the reason that the public supposedly opposes it (though apparently they don't- poll results circulating around the Bush veto listed 70% of the nation being for it) is likely that they don't understand, or believe, the magnitude of the benefits; organ donation would become obsolete with the ability to grow new organs in test tubes, and degenerative diseases (such as many heart problems) could be fixed by injections of healthy stem cells. Stem cell technology could save millions of people, extend life expectancies, and enormously magnify the ability of medical science to

return the debilitated to perfect health- opposing it, IMHO, is socially irresponsible.

Logged

Act; for the universe will never forget your movement, nor will it ever forgive your stillness.

kakkarot

0. The Fool... Inverted?

Posts By Osmosis

\*\*\*\*\*

Posts: 2701

Karma: 3

Pirate "Not-A-Mod" BoB

[View Profile](#)

Re: Stem Cell Research

« Reply #6 on: August 06, 2006, 07:26:44 PM »

it should also be criminally responsible. arrest bush for the murder of millions of innocent people who would otherwise be saved by the bill he aborted! Cheesy

~kakkarot

Logged

Philippians 2:5 Your attitude should be the same as that of Christ Jesus: 6 Who, being in very nature God, did not consider equality with God something to be grasped, 7 but made himself nothing, taking the very nature of a servant, being made in human likeness.

Big Boss

Friggen Crazy

Posts By Osmosis

\*\*\*\*\*

Posts: 1458

Karma: 3

Owner of 100000 V-Points

[View Profile WWW](#)

Re: Stem Cell Research

« Reply #7 on: August 07, 2006, 02:05:41 AM »

Quote from: Zake on August 06, 2006, 05:47:50 PM

They wouldn't even have to use aborted fetuses, under the bill that Bush vetoed- they would use excess embryos from IVF procedures which would be destroyed anyway. It confuses me, therefore, that they won't allow stem cell research, which won't increase the number of destroyed embryos (whatever moral meaning that would have), and at the same time they do allow IVF, which is responsible for lots of embryo destruction in the first place.

It deserves saying another time, too, that the benefits of stem cell technology would be enourmous. Part of the reason that the public supposedly opposes it (though apparently they don't- poll results circulating around the Bush veto listed 70% of the nation being for it) is likely that they don't understand, or believe, the magnitude of the benefits; organ donation would become obsolete with the ability to grow new organs in test tubes, and degenerative diseases (such as many heart problems) could be fixed by injections of healthy stem cells. Stem cell technology could save millions of people, extend life expectancies, and enourmously magnify the ability of medical science to return the debilitated to perfect health- opposing it, IMHO, is socially irresponsible.

not to mention the possibility of regrowing damaged nerve tissue, making parapelagic (sp?) people walk again. Also, they could repair the pancreas, making it produce insulin again in diabetics. The possibilities are so great, I almost condone a little sacrifice to benefit mankind. Bush really pissed me off with that veto.

Logged

Join my Folding@Home team and do some good! #159490

Details at <http://folding.stanford.edu/>

Rafnul!

he-who-posts-lots

Veritas Moderator

Posts By Osmosis

\*\*\*\*\*

Posts: 1081

Karma: 28

[View Profile](#)

Re: Stem Cell Research

« Reply #8 on: August 07, 2006, 06:05:40 AM »

Yes, and amphetamines are miracle drugs.

Logged

DownRodeo

DD-APPROVED! A-OKAYH!!

Veritas Furniture

\*\*\*\*

Posts: 498

Karma: 0

Veritas Furniture

[View Profile WWW](#)

Re: Stem Cell Research

« Reply #9 on: August 07, 2006, 06:15:08 AM »

I wonder if when the governments of the world catch up with the enormous potential of this technology that there will ever be an umbilical chord tax? xD "How long is that one?" "Long enough to fit into the 80% percent bracket!!11hahahaoenoe" They're doing it to one type of fuel already.... Tongue

Logged

"There's a time when the operation of the machine becomes so odious, makes you so sick at heart, that you can't take part, you can't even passively take part, and you've got to put your bodies on the gears and upon the wheels, upon the levers... and you've got to make it stop!"

Mario Savio

Lightbringer

Has a lot of posts

Posts By Osmosis

\*\*\*\*\*

Posts: 793

Karma: 0

Spiritual Warrior

[View Profile](#)

Re: Stem Cell Research

« Reply #10 on: August 07, 2006, 10:59:13 PM »

First of all, Bush vetoed a bill that said that the US government would fund stem cell research. They didn't outright ban it, they just said it wouldn't be a government project. The result of this veto should be minimal since when are the corporations that

classically spend billions and make hundreds of billions with medical research (Helloooo, like Pfizer?) not willing to put their focus and funds into a potential goldmine? Personally, I think it makes perfect sense that the government doesn't fund stem cell research because that's taxpayers' money and the majority of taxpayers DON'T support stem cell research as a whole. Call it fear, ignorance or what-have-you, the government still has no right to take the money of others (misinformed or not) to forward a cause those taxpayers don't agree with. Let people who support such research fund it and make a pretty penny. It's just common-bloody-sense being applied to a controversial issue.

The real issue is not this bill but the basic ethical issue. People just seem to have a senseless need to bitch out Bush whenever they can, no matter how illogical they must become to do so. Thus the focus on the veto.

Logged

The thing that really fascinates me about people is their ability to have no idea what's going on even though it's going on in plain sight all around them and the even more amazing tendency to argue violently when one of these obvious things is presented to them.

Faijer

Existential Pragmatist

Veritas Moderator

Posts By Osmosis

\*\*\*\*\*

Posts: 3201

Karma: 40

The Devil's Advocate

[View Profile WWW](#)

Re: Stem Cell Research

« Reply #11 on: August 08, 2006, 09:03:24 AM »

Peter Jackson alone has donated a total of almost \$1,000,000 to Stem Cell research. Randomly... I'd wager that more than a few rich people are contributing something to it, and there are a lot of rich people out there.

Logged

My WordPress Blog is updated regularly.

NEW UPDATE: Life begins at conception: A thought experiment (29/08/2012)

kakkarot

0. The Fool... Inverted?

Posts By Osmosis

\*\*\*\*\*

Posts: 2701  
Karma: 3

Pirate "Not-A-Mod" BoB

[View Profile](#)

Re: Stem Cell Research

« Reply #12 on: August 08, 2006, 09:30:13 AM »

bah, ruin the fun why doncha \*grumbles as he dismantles the "Bush for Life... in prison!" signs\*

~kakkarot Tongue

Logged

Philippians 2:5 Your attitude should be the same as that of Christ Jesus: 6 Who, being in very nature God, did not consider equality with God something to be grasped, 7 but made himself nothing, taking the very nature of a servant, being made in human likeness.

Zake

Veritas Staff

Veritas Moderator

Posts By Osmosis

\*\*\*\*\*

Posts: 1722

Karma: 1

Veritas Staff

[View Profile](#)

Re: Stem Cell Research

« Reply #13 on: August 08, 2006, 05:25:47 PM »

Quote from: Lightbringer on August 07, 2006, 10:59:13 PM

First of all, Bush vetoed a bill that said that the US government would fund stem cell research. They didn't outright ban it, they just said it wouldn't be a government project. The result of this veto should be minimal since when are the corporations that classically spend billions and make hundreds of billions with medical research (Hellooooo, like Pfizer?) not willing to put their focus and funds into a potential goldmine?

Personally, I think it makes perfect sense that the government doesn't fund stem cell research because that's taxpayers' money and the majority of taxpayers DON'T support stem cell research as a whole. Call it fear, ignorance or what-have-you, the government still has no right to take the money of others (misinformed or not) to forward a cause those taxpayers don't agree with. Let people who support such research fund it and make a pretty penny. It's just common-bloody-sense being applied to a controversial issue.

I would point again at the statistic of 70% of the population supporting the bill he vetoed. Bush is going against the common opinion here, it seems.

Regardless, although he didn't actually ban stem cell research, the impact of a ban on federal funding isn't a laughing matter either. To some extent, it is more of a problem for American science rather than the technology itself- a ban on federal funding will make private investors looking to fund research efforts tend to look elsewhere where there is a more amicable environment. However, IIRC, the nature of the rule means that laboratories which receive federal funding by any means are prevented from studying stem cells- one can't receive federal funding to study cancer cures and also work on stem cells with private funding, unless one has an entirely separate laboratory setup. And, when you get right down to it, federal funding for this sort of long-ish-term science is important. Private companies (like Pfizer) prefer to focus on short-term research projects, as they generate the most immediate return on investments.

There are, indeed, many efforts by private organizations to fund stem cell research, and for that matter, such measures aren't expected to last in the long run... but that doesn't make Bush's veto any less annoying.

« Last Edit: August 08, 2006, 05:33:40 PM by Zake » Logged

Act; for the universe will never forget your movement, nor will it ever forgive your stillness.

solstice

Dreamwalker

Posts By Osmosis

\*\*\*\*\*

Posts: 2114

Karma: -4

"Receive and transmit..."

[View Profile](#)

Re: Stem Cell Research

« Reply #14 on: August 08, 2006, 08:24:20 PM »



Quote

and the majority of taxpayers DON'T support stem cell research as a whole.  
Show us the statistics. Most people know someone who is ill or crippled in some way, which means it is very likely those people are affected by such calamities -- "most" people would then want research done to alleviate these conditions.  
So, I would be much interested in any National polls you have that would negate the desire for stem cell research.

Logged

Tell all the Truth but tell it slant: Success in Circuit lies. Too bright for our infirm Delight. The Truth's superb surprise. As Lightning to the Children eased, with explanation kind. The Truth must dazzle gradually, or every man be blind.

Tefeari: The Giant Impact Hypothesis is a theory

Pages: [1] 2 Print

« previous next »

Jump to:

=> Main Hall

Powered by MySQL Powered by PHP Powered by SMF 1.1.19 | SMF © 2013, Simple Machines

Oxygen design by Bloc Valid XHTML 1.0! Valid CSS!

<http://forums.vociety.net/index.php/topic%2C8834.15.html>

2 captures

07 Jul 2010 - 19 Jun 2013

May JUN Jul

19

2012 2013 2014

About this capture

The Veritas Society

\*

\*HomeForumsChatHelpSearchRetroLoginRegister

Welcome, Guest. Please login or register.

Did you miss your activation email?

June 19, 2013, 12:26:21 PM

Forever

Login with username, password and session length

Search:

Advanced search

208886 Posts in 14833 Topics by 18574 Members - Latest Member: - Wafideossesox

Most online today: 78 - most online ever: 430 (June 28, 2007, 02:58:51 PM)

+ The Veritas Society

|-+ The Auditorium

||-+ Main Hall

|||-+ Stem Cell Research      0 Members and 2 Guests are viewing this topic.

« previous next »

Pages: 1 [2] Print

Author      Topic: Stem Cell Research    (Read 3640 times)

Big Boss

Friggen Crazy

Posts By Osmosis

\*\*\*\*\*

Posts: 1458

Karma: 3

Owner of 100000 V-Points

View Profile WWW

Re: Stem Cell Research

« Reply #15 on: August 09, 2006, 02:53:34 AM »

Quote

Personally, I think it makes perfect sense that the government doesn't fund stem cell research because that's taxpayers' money and the majority of taxpayers DON'T support stem cell research as a whole.

yeah, it's tax payers money, but that's not what bush is ranting on about. he's saying he values life and won't sacrifice potential fetuses to research. I get this feeling that he doesn't want it funded period. However, he's all about his "valued lives" over in Iraq and perhaps soon in Iran and maybe North Korea or whatever.

anyway, I think Bush is just a pawn anyway. Maybe he's not being played by any one person, but the whole network is just making him think he has power and making decisions accordingly. or maybe it's my imagination.

Logged

Join my Folding@Home team and do some good! #159490

Details at <http://folding.stanford.edu/>

Rafnul!

he-who-posts-lots

Posts By Osmosis

\*\*\*\*\*

Posts: 1065  
Karma: 25

View Profile

Re: Stem Cell Research

« Reply #16 on: August 09, 2006, 05:51:55 AM »

As far as I'm aware, Bush wasn't in support of aborting fetuses to gather stem cells.

Logged

Big Boss

Friggen Crazy

Posts By Osmosis

\*\*\*\*\*

Posts: 1458

Karma: 3

Owner of 100000 V-Points

View Profile WWW

Re: Stem Cell Research

« Reply #17 on: August 09, 2006, 05:01:45 PM »

yes, but he's also not in support of using the extra embryos used during the artificial fertilization thing for couples that can't seem to get pregnant. I forget what it's called, where they fertilize like, six eggs, and then give you one, and either throw the other five away or freeze them for some reason. those five eggs will just go to waste, and he doesn't seem to be in support of putting them to use.

Logged

Join my Folding@Home team and do some good! #159490

Details at <http://folding.stanford.edu/>

Razeroth

Veritas Furniture

\*\*\*\*

Posts: 269

Karma: 0

Ut intus , sic vacuus. As within, so without.

[View Profile](#)

Re: Stem Cell Research

« Reply #18 on: August 20, 2006, 12:23:57 AM »

Stem cells are cells that have no life, so there should not be any ethical problems with finding cures by destroying inanimate and otherwise useless vials of...crap. There has been a lot of Bush bashing lately, but he brought it upon himself. He isn't fit for presidency for one singular reason: He tries to do what HE thinks people want. That flaw may not be his fault, but be that as it may, he isn't fit with other people's opinions. For example, why exactly did he veto that bill? Well, because he was being attacked from all sides by people criticizing his "war on terror" and how he invaded Iraq only for oil (which is obviously true, as we don't "help out" non-oil rich countries, do we?). He wanted to seem like the "good guy" or the "moral president" because he is so worried about all the attacks people criticize him with. So he decided to veto a bill that was obviously helpful. However he twisted information, yet again, just to make himself look good. He said that the veto was because he believed something along the lines of humans can't be killed just for science, and yet, the stem cells aren't even complete fetuses, let alone alive... In his blindness, Bush once again screwed up for the country just to preserve his reputation, which he doesn't notice is destroyed...

-Razeroth

Logged

"In the beginning, the primum mobile created the heavens and the earth, and imparted existence. The governing principle of the universe thusforth came forth: duality in its glory..."

Daska\_123

A Familiar Feature

\*\*\*

Posts: 104

Karma: 0

I think I'm beginning to understand...

[View Profile](#)

Re: Stem Cell Research

« Reply #19 on: August 20, 2006, 12:34:51 AM »

Quote from: Razeroth on August 20, 2006, 12:23:57 AM

Stem cells are cells that have no life, so there should not be any ethical problems with finding cures by destroying inanimate and otherwise useless vials of...crap. There has been a lot of Bush bashing lately, but he brought it upon himself. He isn't fit for presidency for one singular reason: He tries to do what HE thinks people want. That flaw may not be his fault, but be that as it may, he isn't fit with other people's opinions. For example, why exactly did he veto that bill? Well, because he was being attacked from all sides by people criticizing his "war on terror" and how he invaded Iraq only for oil (which is obviously true, as we don't "help out" non-oil rich countries, do we?). He wanted to seem like the "good guy" or the "moral president" because he is so worried about all the attacks people criticize him with. So he decided to veto a bill that was obviously helpful. However he twisted information, yet again, just to make himself look good. He said that the veto was because he believed something along the lines of humans can't be killed just for science, and yet, the stem cells aren't even complete fetuses, let alone alive... In his blindness, Bush once again screwed up for the country just to preserve his reputation, which he doesn't notice is destroyed...

-Razeroth

Far too true. But then again I go out living with my motto: What happens happens. Life goes on.

Logged

Singer. Writer. Adventurist.

Lightbringer

Has a lot of posts

Posts By Osmosis

\*\*\*\*\*

Posts: 793

Karma: 0

Spiritual Warrior

[View Profile](#)

Re: Stem Cell Research

« Reply #20 on: August 20, 2006, 10:54:55 AM »

Quote from: Razeroth on August 20, 2006, 12:23:57 AM

For example, why exactly did he veto that bill? Well, because he was being attacked from all sides by people criticizing his "war on terror" and how he invaded Iraq only for oil (which is obviously true, as we don't "help out" non-oil rich countries, do we?).

Bush has remained unaffected by criticism about the war because he knows the reasons many people give are complete bullshit. Was it actually a justified war? I won't dispute that either way but people blame it on a lust for oil. Then why does the

US boycott Iranian oil? They're the 4th largest oil producers in the world and the US is the only country that refuses to buy it from them. Plus, we support oil-free nations in the Middle East like Israel against many oil-rich nations. And quite plainly, if we went to war for oil, why has gas gone up? See wars cause an INCREASE in gas prices because you have oil wells destroyed in fighting (or deliberately) and the oil must be transported through a war zone. Since no one wants to do that supply plummets as demand continues to rise at a greater pace than before because of the fuel being used to run the armies in the area. Any moron (except the fanatical liberals apparently) knows that, most of all the president of the world's strongest military. He could have just persuaded Kuwait to pump more than their fair share of oil from the supply that runs between Iraw and Kuwait and cover it up. If Iraq got pissed no one would care since they were contemplating not letting Saddam pump oil before the war.

Your point is flat out wrong, do some research.

Quote from: Razer0th on August 20, 2006, 12:23:57 AM

He wanted to seem like the "good guy" or the "moral president" because he is so worried about all the attacks people criticize him with. So he decided to veto a bill that was obviously helpful. However he twisted information, yet again, just to make himself look good. He said that the veto was because he believed something along the lines of humans can't be killed just for science, and yet, the stem cells aren't even complete fetuses, let alone alive... In his blindness, Bush once again screwed up for the country just to preserve his reputation, which he doesn't notice is destroyed...

Who are you to determine what and what is not human life? Not to mention your claiming of any type of cell not being alive is ludicrous since the very definition of life is any biological organism at least the size of a cell. The cell is the very smallest unit of life, but the point of the ethical debate is what is human life, and if potential human life at certain dates relative to conception should be treated as human life.

Logged

The thing that really fascinates me about people is their ability to have no idea what's going on even though it's going on in plain sight all around them and the even more amazing tendency to argue violently when one of these obvious things is presented to them.

Razer0th  
Veritas Furniture

\*\*\*\*

Posts: 269

Karma: 0

Ut intus , sic vacuus. As within, so without.

[View Profile](#)

Re: Stem Cell Research

« Reply #21 on: August 20, 2006, 06:40:23 PM »

They don't boycott oil because Bush is in the country, trying to make himself look good by fixing up a dying country just so that he will still have access to oil...many of the claims on Bush are quite justified.

-Razeroth

Logged

"In the beginning, the primum mobile created the heavens and the earth, and imparted existence. The governing principle of the universe thusforth came forth: duality in its glory..."

Lightbringer

Has a lot of posts

Posts By Osmosis

\*\*\*\*\*

Posts: 793

Karma: 0

Spiritual Warrior

[View Profile](#)

Re: Stem Cell Research

« Reply #22 on: August 20, 2006, 09:07:37 PM »

Who doesn't boycott oil because Bush is in their country? I told you the U.S. DOES boycott IRANIAN oil. Bush isn't in Iran, nor is he trying to "fix it" from a "dying" state since they're making plenty of progress towards making nukes to threaten Israel with. You do realize Iran and Iraq are 2 very separate countries right? Just because you continue to spew words into the thread doesn't mean you're making yourself any less wrong. Your rebuttal is not only incoherent, but utterly riddled with dogmatic untruths.

Logged

The thing that really fascinates me about people is their ability to have no idea what's going on even though it's going on in plain sight all around them and the even more amazing tendency to argue violently when one of these obvious things is presented to them.

Razeroth

Veritas Furniture

\*\*\*\*

Posts: 269

Karma: 0

Ut intus , sic vacuus. As within, so without.

[View Profile](#)

Re: Stem Cell Research

« Reply #23 on: August 22, 2006, 11:20:12 AM »

My rebuttal is actually anti-dogmatic, as it separates itself from common views and doesn't enforce it upon the belief systems of any other people, while still welcoming other opinions and beliefs. As for me saying that Bush is in the country, it means that the U.S. is working to help and reform it. It only has that "progress" because the U.S. spends so much money reforming that country. As I said before, many of the negative claims on Bush ARE justified. If you persist in refuting that, then I'll make a quick one: George W. Bush is a bad public speaker. Proof: George W Bush often gets nervous while speaking to a crowd and either begins to screw up the pronunciation of words or stutters, sometimes both. I'm pretty sure this is widely accepted as fact, and it is TECHNICALLY a negative claim. So therefore, some of the negative claims made on George W. Bush are justified. Bush HAS been affected by the war because 1) Many people now dislike him as a result of him starting a war, and 2) He makes more and more questionable actions in front of the public eye that appear in the paper all the time. It might not affect him DIRECTLY, but it does affect him. As for me not regarding a stem cell as having life, that's easily explained. First off, they do not move of their own accord or conscious direction. That is one factor of life. It isn't necessary in all aspects of the animal kingdom for something to be deemed alive, but it is one factor. Second, they are not sentient. And third, I'm not the one deciding. Most scientists regard stem cells as GOOD for research because they provide answers AND aren't YET alive. They may be RELATIVE to life, but they are still not alive. Besides, what would happen to them anyway? Nothing much except for being frozen. Most, if not all, cannot become fetuses because they have been frozen for so long. And I'm not talking about Kuwait or Saddam, I'm talking about Bush being hungry for oil and being affected by the country. By the way, my point has valid and standing arguments, which include research.

-Razeroth

« Last Edit: August 22, 2006, 11:30:07 AM by Razeroth »      Logged

"In the beginning, the primum mobile created the heavens and the earth, and imparted existence. The governing principle of the universe thusforth came forth: duality in its glory..."

Lightbringer

Has a lot of posts

Posts By Osmosis

\*\*\*\*\*



Posts: 793  
Karma: 0

Spiritual Warrior

[View Profile](#)

Re: Stem Cell Research

« Reply #24 on: August 22, 2006, 04:49:22 PM »

Let me quote myself because it seems like you've completely skipped over all points in my post in an attempt to save face by just typing about whatever technicalities you can find, even ones that don't exist.

Quote from: Lightbringer on August 20, 2006, 09:07:37 PM

Just because you continue to spew words into the thread doesn't mean you're making yourself any less wrong.

Give me some proof rather than "Nuh-uh! I'm not wrong cuz I say so and lots of other sources I never cite agree with me!"

And stick to the points at hand instead of creating new trivial ones. I think it's obvious I was talking about Bush's views and policies being practically unaffected by criticism. You talk of how he's losing face with the American people when he's slowly regaining it (the % of people who like the job he's doing has grown by 15% in the last couple months). You claim Bush is hungry for oil but don't say how he intends to get it. You just say "Iraq War = oil" with no further questioning of your own opinion nor do you take into consideration my extremely valid points. You ignore the fact that any biology textbook will tell you a cell is the smallest unit of life (meaning one cell on it's own is ALIVE, so the debate about stem cells is not whether they are alive). What could be more dogmatic?

Logged

The thing that really fascinates me about people is their ability to have no idea what's going on even though it's going on in plain sight all around them and the even more amazing tendency to argue violently when one of these obvious things is presented to them.

Razeroth  
Veritas Furniture

\*\*\*\*

Posts: 269  
Karma: 0

Ut intus , sic vacuus. As within, so without.

[View Profile](#)

Re: Stem Cell Research

« Reply #25 on: August 22, 2006, 05:34:05 PM »

First off, the stem cells are frozen, and therefore dead. Second, I am saying that Bush is affected by the Iraq war, in however small a way that may be, but he is still affected. It is obviously impossible for him not to be. That much is obvious. A war HAS to affect the commander in chief. Bush would not be commander in chief if it did not affect him.

Quote from: Lightbringer on August 22, 2006, 04:49:22 PM

Give me some proof rather than "Nuh-uh! I'm not wrong cuz I say so and lots of other sources I never cite agree with me!"

This is NOT what I am doing, and I am offended by how immature you make me sound here. Every post, I get more and more specific and explain myself more. None of my points are trivial; they are inter-related because they are about Bush. And where do you cite your sources? I could say the same about you, but I haven't. Besides, you haven't asked for a citation until this point, or at least, implied that you wanted one as you did in that quote. I am not trying to merely save face, that would be detrimental to the argument. Whenever George Bush is on public television, he usually screws up his pronunciation. That is my first source of information regarding my earlier example of Bush being a bad public speaker. This is due in part that he has anti-supporters of the war effort. He is losing face in front of the country because while he may have more supporters, democrats are becoming more and more heated in their insults in every mistake he makes, or at least every action he makes that is perceived as a mistake. he may not hear these directly, but he listens to radio shows about him that are definitely insulting. For example, one such radio show would be the Rachel Maddow show on Air America radio, which is held on station number 1190 in New York every morning at 8:00 am to 9:00 am. That right there shows that he has been affected by the war.

Now, back to the stem cell research argument. I have gathered information for the way that President Bush acts and why he does some nonsensical things by listening to the Rachel Maddow show in the morning. It has all the up to date news concerning politics and government news. Recently one of the topics was stem cell research and whether or not it is moral or ethical. That is where I get my evidence.

I also realize that we went off topic with the rest of the rambling on George Bush that

didn't have to do with stem cell research. However, it is all connected because it has to do with President Bush. I have provided my sources of information, now cite or provide yours.

-Razeroth

Logged

"In the beginning, the primum mobile created the heavens and the earth, and imparted existence. The governing principle of the universe thusforth came forth: duality in its glory..."

Pages: 1 [2] Print

« previous next »

Jump to:

=> Main Hall

Powered by MySQL Powered by PHP Powered by SMF 1.1.18 | SMF © 2013, Simple Machines

Oxygen design by Bloc Valid XHTML 1.0! Valid CSS!

<http://forums.vsociety.net/index.php?topic=8466.0>

4 captures

7 Jul 2010 - 17 Jul 2014

Sep JUL Aug

17

2011 2014 2015

About this capture

The Veritas Society

\*

\*HomeForumsChatHelpSearchRetroLoginRegister

Welcome, Guest. Please login or register.

Did you miss your activation email?

July 17, 2014, 03:14:24 AM

Forever

Login with username, password and session length

Search:

Advanced search

214930 Posts in 15322 Topics by 19763 Members - Latest Member: - ksyahu Most  
online today: 110 - most online ever: 430 (June 28, 2007, 02:58:51 PM)

+ The Veritas Society

|-+ The Auditorium

||-+ Main Hall

||-+ Terrorists arrested in Canada 0 Members and 1 Guest are viewing this topic.

« previous next »

Pages: [1] Print

Author Topic: Terrorists arrested in Canada (Read 1277 times)

kakkarot

0. The Fool... Inverted?

Posts By Osmosis

\*\*\*\*\*

Posts: 2701

Karma: 3

Pirate "Not-A-Mod" BoB

View Profile

Terrorists arrested in Canada

« on: June 08, 2006, 09:27:31 AM »

17 men who were going to attack Canadian Parliment and do various things like behead our Prime Minister and blow stuff up have been arrested. Canada kicks ass >:D Go RCMP and CSIS!

(again, do a search if these news reports aren't your political spectrum :P)

[http://www.citytv.com/calgary/news\\_30169.aspx](http://www.citytv.com/calgary/news_30169.aspx)

<http://lawhawk.blogspot.com/2006/06/beheadings-explosions-canadian-terror.html>

[http://today.reuters.com/news/newsarticle.aspx?type=topNews&storyid=2006-06-06T181538Z\\_01\\_N05327372\\_RTRUKOC\\_0\\_US-SECURITY-CANADA.xml&src=rss&rpc=22](http://today.reuters.com/news/newsarticle.aspx?type=topNews&storyid=2006-06-06T181538Z_01_N05327372_RTRUKOC_0_US-SECURITY-CANADA.xml&src=rss&rpc=22)

I kinda find it funny that I read both this story and the one about the FBI invading Capitol Hill on the same day, yet I didn't even think to make a topic about this one XD

~kakkarot

Logged

Philippians 2:5 Your attitude should be the same as that of Christ Jesus: 6 Who, being in very nature God, did not consider equality with God something to be grasped, 7 but made himself nothing, taking the very nature of a servant, being made in human likeness.

Sabrina

A Familiar Feature

\*\*\*

Posts: 111

Karma: 4

[View Profile](#)

Re: Terrorists arrested in Canada

« Reply #1 on: June 10, 2006, 09:54:05 AM »

canada > all Smiley

Logged

kakkarot

0. The Fool... Inverted?

Posts By Osmosis

\*\*\*\*\*

Posts: 2701

Karma: 3

Pirate "Not-A-Mod" BoB

[View Profile](#)

Re: Terrorists arrested in Canada

« Reply #2 on: June 10, 2006, 05:06:13 PM »

Heh, the response of Veritas was more or less the same reaction of most of Canada:

"Terrorists in Canada? \*shrug"

~kakkarot

Logged

Philippians 2:5 Your attitude should be the same as that of Christ Jesus: 6 Who, being in very nature God, did not consider equality with God something to be grasped, 7 but made himself nothing, taking the very nature of a servant, being made in human likeness.

Pages: [1]    Print

« previous next »

Jump to:

=> Main Hall

Powered by MySQL Powered by PHP    Powered by SMF 1.1.19 | SMF © 2013, Simple Machines

Oxygen design by Bloc    Valid XHTML 1.0! Valid CSS!

<http://forums.v society.net/index.php?topic=8462.0>

4 captures

7 Jul 2010 - 17 Jul 2014  
Sep JUL Aug  
17  
2011 2014 2015

About this capture  
The Veritas Society  
\*

\*HomeForumsChatHelpSearchRetroLoginRegister  
Welcome, Guest. Please login or register.  
Did you miss your activation email?  
July 17, 2014, 03:39:21 AM

Forever

Login with username, password and session length  
Search:

Advanced search

214930 Posts in 15322 Topics by 19763 Members - Latest Member: - ksyahu Most  
online today: 117 - most online ever: 430 (June 28, 2007, 02:58:51 PM)

+ The Veritas Society

|-+ The Auditorium

| |-+ Main Hall

|| |-+ FBI raid Capitol Hill 0 Members and 1 Guest are viewing this topic. « previous  
next »

Pages: [1] Print

Author Topic: FBI raid Capitol Hill (Read 3218 times)

kakkarot

0. The Fool... Inverted?

Posts By Osmosis

\*\*\*\*\*

Posts: 2701

Karma: 3

Pirate "Not-A-Mod" BoB

View Profile

FBI raid Capitol Hill

« on: June 07, 2006, 08:11:36 PM »

I'm surprised noone's posted a topic about it yet.

some links to some news articles (find your own if you're a particular political wing Tongue)

<http://www.govexec.com/dailyfed/0506/052206cdpm1.htm>

<http://www.voanews.com/english/2006-05-30-voa68.cfm>

<http://www.abcnews.go.com/Politics/wireStory?id=2019950>

<http://www.cnn.com/2006/POLITICS/05/25/raid.on.congress.ap/> and

<http://www.cnn.com/2006/POLITICS/05/27/jefferson.fbi/>

First time ever that the Legislative Branch of the USA has been raided. I saw sweet. I don't think any place on American soil (or the soil of any country) should be invincible from legal actions from American legal authorities.

People are claiming it was unconstitutional, yet I looked through the Constitution and the Amendments and I saw nothing at all saying it was unconstitutional. Anyone kobok wanna point out what I missed? Smiley

[http://www.archives.gov/national-archives-experience/charters/constitution\\_transcript.html](http://www.archives.gov/national-archives-experience/charters/constitution_transcript.html)

[http://www.archives.gov/national-archives-experience/charters/bill\\_of\\_rights\\_transcript.html](http://www.archives.gov/national-archives-experience/charters/bill_of_rights_transcript.html) <-- Amendments to the Constitution Tongue

~kakkarot

« Last Edit: June 07, 2006, 08:17:12 PM by kakkarot »      Logged

Philippians 2:5 Your attitude should be the same as that of Christ Jesus: 6 Who, being in very nature God, did not consider equality with God something to be grasped, 7 but made himself nothing, taking the very nature of a servant, being made in human likeness.

Rafnul!

he-who-posts-lots

Veritas Moderator

Posts By Osmosis

\*\*\*\*\*

Posts: 1081

Karma: 28

[View Profile](#)

Re: FBI raid Capitol Hill

« Reply #1 on: June 07, 2006, 08:31:09 PM »

Yeah kobok and I talked about this in chat while other people were just generating spam...

Logged  
kobok  
Veritas Council  
Tech Team  
Posts By Osmosis  
\*\*\*\*\*

Posts: 4891  
Karma: 158

Veritas Council

[View Profile](#)

Re: FBI raid Capitol Hill

« Reply #2 on: June 08, 2006, 03:07:01 AM »

The relevant portion of the constitution is article 1, section 6, first paragraph:

Quote from: Founding Father

The Senators and Representatives shall receive a Compensation for their Services, to be ascertained by Law, and paid out of the Treasury of the United States. They shall in all Cases, except Treason, Felony and Breach of the Peace, be privileged from Arrest during their Attendance at the Session of their respective Houses, and in going to and returning from the same; and for any Speech or Debate in either House, they shall not be questioned in any other Place.

Note the key nature of this provision. It provides for separation of power in the execution of that power. If, for example, a senator shoots somebody in a park, that senator is subject to arrest. If a senator stands up and says, "We need to authorize person X to be shot in a park", and then 51 senators vote to authorize someone being shot in a park, the senator is not subject to arrest for this. The Supreme Court could overturn the senate's authorization to shoot someone in the park, but its power would not extend to any punishment of the senator who proposed it or the senators who voted for it, and the FBI cannot arrest the senator while standing in front of the senate requesting this, they cannot arrest him later for it, nor can the FBI take documents relating to the speech the senator has prepared for standing up and saying this to the senate.

In this specific case, we have a congressman Jefferson who is accused of a corruption charge, specifically, of taking \$100,000 from an FBI informant and sticking it in his freezer. The money was already found in his freezer at home in August of 2005, so



this is not what this recent problem was about. The constitutional problem is that the FBI, a part of the executive branch and thus under the authority of the White House, stormed into a congressional office and took documents from that office.

This, by most expert opinions, violates the constitutional clause above. In the past, documents required from congress for criminal investigations have been subpoenaed, and are then handed over, without permitting full search of congress. And they're probably right that it sets a very dangerous precedent to have congressional offices subject to search. When one branch of government gains the ability to harass, intimidate, or prosecute another branch of government during the normal course of their duties, you put the freedom and safety of the country on a very dangerous course. One need only study a little history to know how quickly that arrangement can destabilize.

« Last Edit: June 08, 2006, 03:11:25 AM by kobok »    Logged

Latest article: Construct Dynamics

Want to learn psi? Check out our collection of psi articles.

Faijer

Existential Pragmatist

Veritas Moderator

Posts By Osmosis

\*\*\*\*\*

Posts: 3201

Karma: 40

The Devil's Advocate

View Profile WWW

Re: FBI raid Capitol Hill

« Reply #3 on: June 08, 2006, 04:43:56 AM »

I swear, kobok must have J.Betts', "The Big Book of Every Answer to Every Question Ever Imaginable by Any Being at Any Time in Any Form".

It's the only explanation as to why he can come up with all these answers grin

Logged

My WordPress Blog is updated regularly.

NEW UPDATE: Life begins at conception: A thought experiment (29/08/2012)

SethLaRoth DeShawl

Regular Member

Posts By Osmosis

\*\*\*\*\*

Posts: 581  
Karma: 10

[View Profile](#)

Re: FBI raid Capitol Hill  
« Reply #4 on: June 08, 2006, 06:07:26 AM »  
you forgot, "and from or in any place"

either that or Carol Bolts Book published by Hyperion of answers or maybe,  
\*shifts eyes suspiciously\*

he is god...

Logged  
Ambrose  
Greenhorn  
Settling In  
\*

Posts: 31  
Karma: 0

A Ghost

[View Profile](#)

Re: FBI raid Capitol Hill  
« Reply #5 on: June 08, 2006, 06:25:34 AM »  
Personally I think he has an advanced copy of "The Hitchhiker's Guide to the Galaxy"  
stashed somewhere; or a depressed robot with the brain the size of a small planet  
helping him out...

Or as Qrisis said... \*looks around suspiciously\*

On the backstory though; Was there any mention of a failed subpoena, or a reason why  
a raid became necessary? It seems like a big step for the FBI to take suddenly, unless  
they had run out of options.

Logged  
-Ambrose Athan, the Good Doctor and the "Destiny Nazi"